

We conclude from this that the Classics designate as the enemy, against which the international revolution must be directed, that form of capitalism which they term "imperialism"; and that they declare that any war waged against such imperialism is a just war and any war waged in its behalf is an unjust war.

Equally basic with the international and revolutionary character of the movement is the tenet of the dictatorship of the proletariat. In view of the divergence of testimony of witnesses for Petitioner and those of Respondent concerning the meaning and application of this tenet, we have taken particular pains to ascertain its real character. It is best understood from the volume *Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (Pet. Ex. 423), which is one of a series of "Readings in Leninism," consisting of articles and excerpts dealing with basic points of Leninist theory. Lenin's postulates on this question (pp. 47-54) make clear how important this phase of the revolution is deemed. Having once seized power through revolution, he states it becomes necessary that this power be held by a "dictatorship of the proletariat." A definition of what this is intended to be appears on page 49:

The dictatorship of the proletariat is not the end of the class struggle but its continuation in new forms. The dictatorship of the proletariat \* \* \* which has achieved victory and has seized political power, against the bourgeoisie who have been defeated but not annihilated, who have not disappeared, who have not ceased their resistance, who have increased their resistance.

Lenin makes clear that this dictatorship is not to be confused in any way with "popular" and "nonclass" government. He goes on to say:

The class that has seized political power has done so, conscious of the fact that it has seized power alone. This is implicit in the concept of the dictatorship of the proletariat. This concept has meaning only when one class knows that it alone takes political power into its own hands, and does not deceive either itself or others by talk about popular, elected government, sanctified by the whole people.

Having seized power, the proletariat may find it necessary to enter into certain alliances to maintain that power. These alliances, however, are only temporary for the purpose of consolidating the revolutionary victory. It is emphasized again on page 52 that violence is essential, although not exclusive. The following passages are enlightening:

But, of course, the dictatorship of the proletariat does not merely mean violence, although there is no dictatorship without violence.

Dictatorship (says Lenin) does not mean violence alone, although it is impossible without violence. It likewise signifies a higher organization of labor than that which previously existed (*Collected Works*, Russian edition, Vol. XXIV, p. 305).

It involves the concept of "exercise of violence, unrestricted by law" (p. 54). Also significant is the position to be held by the Communist Party in the dictatorship of the proletariat. It is stated (p. 100): "The stronger the Communist Party created by us in each country the sooner will the 'Soviet idea' triumph." The Communist Party has declared itself to be necessary to the working class not only before the seizure of power and not only during the seizure of power, but before the power has passed into the hands of the working class. It is further stated (p. 101) that the Party must keep in control until the classless society is finally attained.

From *Problems of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 138, pp. 34-38) it will be seen what meaning Lenin and Stalin give to the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the core of the dictatorship is the Party which gives

directions. These directions are carried out by the mass organizations of the proletariat and are fulfilled by the general population. The minority seizes power and controls because the exploited workers have not yet developed their human faculties. There is another step which may become necessary. If the bourgeoisie resist or there is intervention in its behalf then the active body is the proletariat as a class. The Party takes power; the Party governs the country, and it is the core of this power; but it takes power in the name and purportedly on behalf of the class.

In *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 53), the origin of the dictatorship of the proletariat is thus stated:

Briefly: *the dictatorship of the proletariat is the rule—unrestricted by law and based on force—of the proletariat over the bourgeoisie, a rule enjoying the sympathy and support of the labouring and exploited masses (The State and Revolution).*

From this follow two main conclusions:

*First conclusion:* The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be "complete" democracy, democracy for all, for the rich as well as for the poor; the dictatorship of the proletariat "must be a state that is democratic in a new way—for *the proletarians and the propertyless in general—and dictatorial in a new way—against* the bourgeoisie \* \* \*" (Lenin, *Selected Works*, Vol. VII, p. 34) (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 53). \*[my italics—J. S.]

*Second conclusion:* The dictatorship of the proletariat cannot arise as the result of the peaceful development of bourgeois society and of bourgeois democracy; it can arise only as the result of the smashing of the bourgeois state machine, the bourgeois army, the bourgeois bureaucratic machine, the bourgeois police (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 54).

We conclude that "dictatorship of the proletariat" as used in the Classics connotes a seizure of power by or in the name of the proletariat through violence, if necessary, and the absolute and despotic rule by a minority in the name of the proletariat.

In addition to the requirements for a rigid Party organization with a hard core of dedicated workers, noted above, the overall policies and rules for effectuating the ends and objectives of the Party are to be found in the Classics. These are effected through an organizational principle known as "Democratic Centralism" and by general directions for strategy and tactics.

The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 198) states that in July and August 1917, prior to the successful October Revolution, the CPSU adopted "new Party rules" providing that "all Party organizations shall be built on the principle of *democratic centralism*," which provided, inter alia, that all directing bodies of the Party shall be elected; that they give periodic reports to Party organizations; that there be strict Party discipline and the subordination of the minority to the majority; and that all decisions of higher bodies shall be absolutely binding on lower bodies and on all Party members.

*Strategy and Tactics of The Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 343, p. 62) states:

The Party is the vanguard of the working class, and consists of the best, most class conscious, most active and most courageous members. It incorporates the whole body of experience of the proletarian struggle. Basing itself upon the revolutionary theory of Marxism and representing the general and lasting interests of the whole of the working class, the Party personifies the unity of proletarian principles, of proletarian will and of proletarian revolutionary action. It is a revolutionary organization, bound by iron discipline and strict revolutionary rules of democratic centralism, which can be carried out owing to the class consciousness of the proletarian vanguard, to its loyalty to the revolution, its ability



to maintain inseparable ties with the proletarian masses and to its correct political leadership which is constantly verified and clarified by the experiences of the masses themselves.

"Democratic Centralism" is stated by the witnesses for Respondent to represent the highest form of democracy in that it provides that all decisions and policies of the Party are determined by the membership and that authority flowed up from this membership through intermediate local and regional committees to the central committee. A decision once made, however, would be binding on all members. Witnesses for Petitioner testified that "Democratic Centralism" was theoretically a two-way process by which authority flowed upward from Party cells through intermediate local or regional committees to the top and discipline flowed downward from the same channels. However, they stated that in practice the double process has been reduced to a single process in which discipline flows downward with limited right of discussion in the lower echelons on matters of local tactics.<sup>26</sup>

This policy is strongly expressed in the *Programme of the Communist International* (Pet. Ex. 125, p. 84):

This international Communist discipline must find expression in the subordination of the partial and local interests of the movements to its general and lasting interests and in the strict fulfillment, by all members, of the decisions passed by the leading bodies of the Communist International.

The idea behind democratic centralism is best expressed by Stalin in *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, pp. 119-121): What is required for success is an iron party under iron discipline. A Communist Party will only be able to perform its duty if its Party center is a powerful and authoritative organ. No factions are permitted—there must be absolute unity of will and that must emanate from the Party's center. All groups or factions which disagree must be immediately expelled.

We conclude from the whole record that "Democratic Centralism", as it is used in the Classics, is an organizational principle which contemplates a rigid discipline emanating from the top of the movement, binding on the parent and all subsidiary organizations and on all members of such organizations. Failure to adhere to such discipline is punishable by expulsion from the movement.

With the organizational structure thus indicated, the Classics then provide strategic and tactical directions for arriving at the objectives of Marxism-Leninism.

One of the characteristics of Marxism-Leninism is that in addition to its doctrine it also provides directives for the attainment of the objectives contemplated by such doctrine. Marxism-Leninism is declared to be a guide to action (*History of the CPSU (Bolshevik)*) (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 306). While the ends to be reached are fixed, the manner and methods of reaching them, it will be seen, are exceedingly

<sup>26</sup> As witness Kornfeder states it, he was taught that the Party's basic form of organization is a supercentralized political party with a high degree of discipline. He describes it as a military type of political organization with an established chain of command, permitting lower units considerable leeway in discussing local tactical problems. He states that he was taught that the general staff or the general headquarters of the organization was the Communist International, in Moscow. At the time of which he speaks, he says that the Communist parties of all countries were affiliated with the Communist International. Witness Philbrick stated when asked whether a member of his group could refuse to accept the decision of the Communist Party and still continue membership in the Communist Party of the United States, that such member could not continue as a member of the Party. Witness Lautner says that it was a breach of democratic centralism for any Communist Party anywhere, including the CPUSA, to refuse to follow the dictates of the Soviet Union.

flexible. What these are appear most concisely in *Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 343).

In summary, it states the following: The strategy and tactics were elaborated in the period of proletarian revolution when the question of the overthrow of the bourgeoisie became a question of immediate practice. Lenin brought into the light of day the ideas of Marx and Engels on tactics and strategy and developed them further into a "system of rules and principles for the leadership of the class struggle of the proletariat" (p. 8). Communists of every country must adapt themselves to the peculiar features of the economics, politics, culture and national composition of the country in which they are operating (p. 14). As long as national and state differences exist among peoples and countries, the unity of international tactics of the Communist working-class movement requires, not the elimination of variety, but an adaptation of the fundamental principles of Communism (Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat) to the national and state differences. The vanguard of the working class having been won over, the next step is to seek the transition or approach to the proletarian revolution (p. 15). The revolutionary class must be able to master all forms of social activity and must be ready to pass from one form to another with the utmost expedition (p. 16). The tactics of the Bolsheviks were correct because they were the only international tactics and did everything possible in one country for the development, support and stirring up of the revolution in all countries (p. 16). Bolshevism has helped in a practical way to develop the proletarian revolution in Europe and America (p. 17). The world proletarian revolution has been assisted, accelerated and supported by the victory of the proletariat in Russia (p. 18). The objective elements of the working class movement are the economic development of the country, the development of capitalism, the disintegration of the old government, the spontaneous movements of the proletariat. The collision of classes proceeds irrespective of the will of the proletariat. But the subjective element, the reflection in the minds of the proletariat of these processes, is the subject of the directing influences of strategy and tactics (p. 19).

The theory of Marxism postulates that the fall of the bourgeoisie, the seizure of power by the proletariat and the replacement of capitalism by socialism are inevitable (p. 20). Strategy is the determination of the direction of the main blow of the proletariat at a given stage of the revolution (p. 21) and it changes with the transition of the revolution from one stage to another and remains unchanged throughout the duration of a given stage (p. 22). Tactics are the determination of the line of conduct of the proletariat during the ebb and flow of the movement, changing the forms of struggle and its slogans (p. 25). Thus, in the Russian revolution changes were made as the struggle progressed; strikes, boycotts, slogans were used and varied along with the forms of organization, a worker's party operated more or less openly, as the immediate situation required. In the earlier phases the Party was compelled to resort to tactics of retreat. When the revolution ebbed, operations were less open and the Party went underground; and cultural work and the organizations "permitted by law" took the place of revolutionary mass organizations. The same was true during later stages of the revolution (p. 26). Tactics are



the operations suited to the concrete situation of the struggle at any given moment (p. 27). The successful struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat presupposes the existence in every country of a compact Communist Party, hardened in the struggle, disciplined, centralized and closely linked up with the masses. The Party is a revolutionary organization, with these fundamental strategic aims: It must extend its influence over the majority of the members of its own class, including working women and youth. It must secure predominant influence in the broad mass proletarian organizations, e. g., trade unions, factory councils, cooperatives, sport and cultural organizations. It is particularly important to win over the trade unions (p. 62). Leadership of wide sections of the toiling masses should be acquired by the proletariat and the membership of the middle classes of the peasantry must be secured (p. 63). It must carry on propaganda against all forms of "chauvinism" and against "imperialist" maltreatment of enslaved peoples and races (e. g., Negroes, "yellow labor" and anti-Semitism) (p. 64).

In determining its line of tactics, each National Communist Party must take into account the concrete internal and external situation, the correlation of class forces, the degree of stability and strength of the bourgeoisie and fit slogans and methods of struggle to the circumstances of the particular country. Demands and slogans must be lent to the revolutionary aim of capturing power and overthrowing bourgeois capitalist society. The party is to utilize the daily needs and struggles of the working class as a starting point from which to lead the working class to the revolutionary struggle for power (pp. 65-66). When the ruling class is disorganized, propaganda in favor of increasingly transitional slogans and mass action should be used. Strikes and armed demonstrations should be used, as well as intensified revolutionary work in the army and the navy (p. 66). When conditions are right, it is dangerous to fail to start rebellion. When the revolutionary tide is at ebb, partial slogans and demands should be made which correspond with the everyday needs of the workers. United front tactics should then be used (p. 67). In this period of marking time, demands and slogans should be made in such spheres as labor, local politics, and world politics, e. g., the attitude toward the U. S. S. R., the struggle against "imperialism" and the war danger, and systematic preparation for the fight against imperial war (p. 68). Also systematic work must be carried on among the proletarian and peasant youth; and, in imperialist countries, Communist Parties must impair the war effort against colonies (p. 69). The further consolidation of the Land of the Soviets, the mighty growth of the international authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the growth of the Communist International are all accelerating the development of the world Socialist revolution. The capitalist world is entering a period of sharp clashes. The united front of the working class must be established. The victory of the revolution has to be prepared for by a strong proletarian revolutionary party (pp. 81-82). When the country in which they live engages in an imperialist war in order to utilize the economic and political crisis, it is the duty of Communists to turn the war into a civil war for the overthrow of capitalism (pp. 94-95). Should an imperialist war break out, the interest of the workers of all countries demands that the defense of the Soviet Union be considered paramount (pp. 95-96).

From this résumé, it becomes apparent that the rules for making the doctrine effective have within them instructions for short-range and long-range action and that they are intended for more than local application. In addition, there has been provided an elasticity which makes them applicable under an endless variety of circumstances. Considerable significance, therefore, may attach to their use by allied groups under given circumstances at a given time. Therefore, the manner and extent of their application by the CPUSA is a factor to be considered in determining whether the United States Party is a part of a worldwide movement and whether it is dominated and controlled by the Soviet Union.

Another factor of Marxism-Leninism which pervades the Classics with the same insistence as its international revolutionary character is the dominant position of the Soviet Union, that is to say, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in the world Communist movement. At an earlier date, i. e., after the successful revolution in Russia, Stalin points out (*Problems of Leninism*, Pet. Ex. 138, p. 64) that for an ultimate victory of socialism in the world, the protection of that Russian victory by workers of all countries is necessary. In *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121 at p. 19) he quotes Lenin:

"History has now confronted us [i. e., the Russian Marxists-J. S.] with an immediate task which is the most revolutionary of all the immediate tasks that confront the proletariat of any country. The fulfillment of this task, the destruction of the most powerful bulwark, not only of European, but also of Asiatic reaction, would make the Russian proletariat the vanguard of the international revolutionary proletariat."

In other words, the centre of the revolutionary movement was bound to shift to Russia.

As we know, the course of the revolution in Russia has more than vindicated Lenin's prediction.

Is it surprising, after all this, that a country which has accomplished such a revolution and possesses such a proletariat should have been the birthplace of the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution?

Is it surprising that Lenin, the leader of this proletariat, became the creator of this theory and tactics and the leader of the international proletariat?

In *The Theory of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 422, p. 87) Stalin states it is necessary to support Russia in order to make it "the basis of the further unfolding of the world revolution, into the lever for the further disintegration of imperialism." He emphasizes this (p. 88) by asserting that "the victorious proletariat of Russia" should "after it has expropriated the capitalists and organized its socialist production at home," rise against the capitalist world, attract to itself the oppressed classes of other countries, raise insurrection in them against the capitalist - and even use military force against the exploiting classes and their states.

Dimitroff in *The United Front* (Pet. Ex. 149, at pp. 279 and 280) restates the importance of the U. S. S. R. to the international proletariat. And in the *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 67) it will be seen that the Russian Soviet Republic is "grouping around itself the Soviet movements of the vanguard of the workers in all countries."

What is being advocated is an extension of Lenin's hard-core principle to a wider area. Whereas in the Soviet Union the party is that core, in the world scheme the U. S. S. R. becomes the center. As such, it must be protected, and from it will emanate leadership which



will direct and hold together the party in other countries. This thought is thus expressed in *Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 343, p. 81):

In the struggle to defend against fascism the bourgeois-democratic liberties and the gains of the toilers, in the struggle to overthrow fascist dictatorship, the revolutionary proletariat prepares its forces, strengthens its fighting contacts with its allies and directs the struggle toward the goal of achieving real democracy of the toilers—Soviet power.

The further consolidation of the Land of the Soviets, the rallying of the world proletariat around it, and the mighty growth of the international authority of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the turn toward revolutionary class struggle which has set in among the Social-Democratic workers and the workers organized in the reformist trade unions, the increasing mass resistance to fascism and the growth of the revolutionary movement in the colonies, the decline of the Second International and the growth of the Communist International, are all accelerating and will continue to accelerate the development of the world Socialist revolution.

At pages 95 and 96, it is declared that if an imperialist war breaks out, the defense of the Soviet Union must be considered paramount.

It will be seen from the above that allegiance to the Soviet Union assumes considerable proportions in the Classics of Marxism-Leninism. First, after the 1917 Revolution, it must be protected from outside intervention. Thereafter, its role as a leader of a successful world revolution is stressed. At all times, loyalty and assistance are due it in a conflict which may arise between it and any "imperialist" power.

We conclude from the Classics that the Soviet Union has a specific place in Marxism-Leninism; it represents the first victory of the proletariat; therefore, it is the center of the world proletariat and it is entitled to the allegiance of the proletariat everywhere. The authority of its Communist Party is international. The corollary of this is that a Communist Party which adheres to Marxism-Leninism is, of necessity, under the domination and control of the Soviet Union.

It is also evident from the Classics that as the Soviet Union is to be considered the leader of the world proletariat in the class war, so the United States takes on a special importance as the mightiest of the "imperialist" powers, the arch enemy of the proletariat. Lenin, in *Imperialism* (Pet. Ex. 140, p. 125) states: "In the United States, economic development in the last decades has been even more rapid than in Germany, and for this very reason the parasitic character of modern American capitalism has stood out with particular prominence." Stalin points out (*Foundations of Leninism*, Pet. Ex. 121, last par., p. 55 and 1st two pars., p. 56) that conditions in the United States had changed since the days of Marx and that this country could no longer be considered one in which there could be a "peaceful evolution of bourgeois democracy into a proletarian democracy." The United States has become definitely "imperialistic" and "the law of violent proletarian revolution" becomes applicable to it. This quotation from Lenin in this connection (p. 56) reveals how strongly the Soviet Union felt that action was required in this country:

Today, said Lenin, "in 1917, in the epoch of the first great imperialist war, this qualification made by Marx is no longer valid. Both England and America, the greatest and the last representatives—in the whole world—of Anglo-Saxon 'liberty,' in the sense that militarism and bureaucracy were absent, have slid down entirely into the all-European, filthy, bloody morass of military-bureaucratic institutions to which everything is subordinated and which trample everything underfoot. Today, both in England and in America, the 'preliminary condition for every real people's revolution' is the smashing, the destruction of the 'ready-

made state machine' (brought in those countries, between 1914 and 1917, to general 'European imperialist perfection'" (Selected Works, Vol. VII, p. 37).

A *Resolution on the American Question* (Pet. Ex. 43) issued by the Communist International in 1929, begins with the statement that: "The United States of America has developed into the mightiest imperialist power \* \* \*. The task of the Workers (Communist) Party is to form a broad united front and to intensify the struggle against American imperialism." (See also Tr. 619-667-68.) Specific attention is directed to this aspect of the approach to be used in applying Marxism-Leninism to the United States. In Dimitroff's *The United Front* (Pet. Ex. 149, pp. 41-43) an anti-Fascist party is suggested. We find, at page 43, some revealing language. "Our comrades in the United States acted rightly in taking the initiative for the creation of such a party. \* \* \* We should develop the most widespread movement for the creation of such a party, and take the lead in it." The "we" who are planning parties in the United States have "comrades" there who have already started work in that direction. The *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 28) has this to say:

The class struggle in almost every country of Europe and America is entering the phase of civil war. Under such conditions the Communists can have no confidence in bourgeois laws. They should create everywhere a parallel illegal apparatus which at the decisive moment should do its duty by the party, and in every way possible assist the revolution. In every country where, in consequence of martial law or of other exceptional laws, the Communists are unable to carry on their work lawfully, a combination of lawful and unlawful work is absolutely necessary.

In *Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution* it is stated (p. 17):

Bolshevism has helped in a practical way to develop the proletarian revolution in Europe and America more powerfully than any party in any other country has ever succeeded in doing.

From these expressions, it must be concluded that the Classics disclose a positive attitude on the subject of the United States which makes it a prime objective for the activities of the Soviet Union and for any of its subsidiaries.

In order fully to understand what Marxism-Leninism is, the significance of certain of its programs and policies must be considered. Certainly in the Classics themselves, these programs and policies are all aimed at one objective: the forwarding of the world revolution. That such a revolution was not an evolutionary one in the normal use of this term appears from Stalin's statement in the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 168) which he presents as one of Lenin's teachings; without a revolution of the working class capitalism cannot be overthrown; even though capitalism is moribund, it must be given the coup de grace:

Lenin showed that under imperialism the unevenness of development and the contradictions of capitalism have grown particularly acute, that the struggle for markets and fields for the export of capital, the struggle for colonies, for sources of raw material, makes periodical imperialist wars for the redivision of the world inevitable.

There is nothing to indicate that "The elements of a war of liberation from imperialism" is used in any figurative sense. The context in which this appears leads to a contrary conclusion.



Consequently, while some of the policies and programs may have a dual character, one of the elements of each of them is always the furtherance of the *war* against capitalism and of speeding the ultimate victory of the proletariat over the "imperialists." This we find to be so in work with and in labor unions, with youth and with minorities; it is the real purpose in resorting to secrecy, entering into united fronts, and in resorting to slogans; it is the motivating force in training Communists, requiring reports from them and insisting that they do not deviate from the strict Party line.

As appears from Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* (Pet. Ex. 417, pp. 105, *et seq.*) the Marxist should not be interested in labor unions, as such, but rather from the use which can be made of such organizations as part of the revolutionary scheme. A union can be used as a front for political, agitational, and revolutionary organizations. As Stalin points out in *Problems of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 138, p. 30), they are the all-embracing organizations of the working class. "They constitute a school of Communism." "They unite the masses of the workers with the vanguard." In effect, what Lenin and Stalin are saying is: Here are ready-made groups of substantial size, made up of members of the class which according to the labor theory of value are the exploited, and consequently should belong in the revolution; and infiltration of such groups by a hard core of diligent workers for the Party offers a ready field for propaganda and proselytizing. As it is stated in the *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 29):

Every party desirous of belonging to the Communist International should be bound to carry on systematic and persistent Communist work in labor unions, cooperatives, and other labor organizations of the masses.

The same volume discusses the trade-union movement (p. 53, *et seq.*), and (at p. 57) it states:

Consequently, the Communists must strive to create as far as possible complete unity between the trade unions and the Communist Party, and to subordinate the unions to the practical leadership of the Party, as the advance guard of the workers' revolutions.

*Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 343, pp. 67-68) states that one of the principal tasks of a Communist is the joining of a union to win the leadership in the workers' struggle.

We conclude that the Classics direct Communists to engage in activity in trade unions in order to utilize such unions for the purposes of the Party and to further the world revolution.

The Classics disclose that youth programs are considered to be important. Concerning the Young Communist League, Stalin says in *Problems of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 138, p. 31):

Its task is to help the Party educate the younger generation in the spirit of socialism. It provides young reserves for all the other mass organizations of the proletariat in all branches of administration.

Lenin's attitude on the necessity of particular emphasis on youth may be gleaned in part from two quotations in an article in *Political Affairs* (Pet. Ex. 477, pp. 86 and 88):

Is it not natural for young people to predominate in our party, the party of revolution? We are the party of the future and the future belongs to the youth. We are a party of innovators and innovators are always followed most eagerly by the youth. We are a party of self-sacrificing struggle against the rotten old system, and the youth are always the first in self-sacrificing struggles.

\* \* \* \* \*

The youth will decide the issue of the whole struggle, the student youth, and still more the working-class youth. \* \* \* Do not fear their lack of training, do not tremble at their inexperience and lack of development. If you are unable to organize and stimulate them to action, they will turn to the Mensheviks and Gapon, and this inexperience of theirs will cause five times more damage. \* \* \* Only you must unfailingly organize, organize and organize hundreds of circles. \* \* \* Either you create new, young, fresh, energetic, militant organizations everywhere for revolutionary Social-Democratic work of all sorts and kinds, and among all strata, or you will perish, enveloped in the glory of "committee" bureaucrats.

Dimitroff offers another reason for enlisting the efforts of youth (*The United Front*, Pet. Ex. 149, p. 150):

The whole antifascist youth is interested in uniting and organizing its forces. Therefore you, comrades, must find such ways, forms and methods of work as will assure the formation, in the capitalist countries, of a new type of mass youth organizations, to which no vital interest of the working youth will be alien, organizations, which, without copying the Party, will fight for all the interests of the youth and will bring up the youth in the spirit of the class struggle and proletarian internationalism, in the spirit of Marxism-Leninism.

There is no question that the enrolling and training of youth is deemed to have value in the world revolutionary movement. From the *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 8), it appears that the International League of Communist Youth was given a representative with a right to vote on the Executive Committee of the Communist International and the Communist International had the right to a similar representative on the Executive Committee of the League. And in the *Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 343, p. 69), it is stated that "Systematic work must also be carried on among the proletarian and peasant youth. \* \* \*" It will be seen from this that a youth program is considered an essential part of the activities of the Party in all countries and is required by the dictates of Marxism-Leninism.

We conclude that the Classics direct Communists to engage in youth programs for the purposes of the Party and to provide reserves for the world revolution.

In *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 89), Stalin states that Lenin developed the tactics of Marx and Engels and combined them into a system of rules and guiding principles for the leadership of the class struggle.

Among these, as noted above, is the use of slogans and their propaganda value (*Strategy and Tactics of the Proletarian Revolution*, Pet. Ex. 343, pp. 66-67); *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 92). "Imperialism" is one of these; and as a corollary thereto, "anti-imperialism" and "just and unjust wars." "Peace" was another of the slogans which eventually came into use. These slogans have been used by the Soviet Union, by the Communist Parties throughout the world, and by the CPUSA. Their common use, contemporaneously and currently by the Soviet Union and the CPUSA, is significant. Their use also is recommended for the purpose of forwarding the world revolution (*Strategy and Tactics*, *supra*).

The same can be said to apply to united-front tactics. Throughout the Classics, the value of such tactics is stressed. The extent of such collaboration furnishes a considerable part of the texts of the writings of Lenin and Stalin. Dimitroff's *The United Front* (Pet. Ex. 149) devotes itself to that tactical principle. Again, it should be noted that united fronts, at the organizational, political and national levels,



are to be used but not in any way that might bolster capitalism. At all times they are to be used to protect the Party in Russia, to increase the number of its adherents and always to promote the world revolution. Their simultaneous adoptions by the Parties in various forms in various countries also cannot be ignored. This stands out particularly at the time of the Soviet Union's changes of alliances before and during World War II.

We conclude that the use of slogans as shibboleths for the purposes of Communist Parties, including Respondent, in order to advance the world revolution, is directed by the Classics.

Secrecy and its uses also finds a place of prominence in the Classics. (See Pet. Ex. 343, pp. 22-26; and Pet. Ex. 417.) Respondent contends that its practice by the CPUSA was not for the purpose of concealing foreign direction, domination and control or of expediting or promoting its objectives, but rather to protect its members from local hysteria or from being harassed and penalized economically for the holding of unpopular views. In *What Is To Be Done?* which Respondent urged its members to read as recently as 1951, Lenin shows how Party members can use trade unions as a front, keeping their identity as revolutionists secret. Stalin, in his speeches on the CPUSA (Pet. Ex. 109), published by the Central Committee of the CPUSA, in pamphlet form, speaks of the danger of exposing the "conspirative" nature of the Communist Party. The manner of use and timing, and the nature and degree of these practices negatives the contention of Respondent's witnesses. Certainly, as used in the Classics, secrecy was not always to be used for legal purposes (*What Is To Be Done?* Pet. Ex. 417, p. 107).

We conclude that the secrecy directed by the Classics is, among other things, for the purpose of concealing the conspiratorial nature of Communist Parties and for the advancement of the world revolution.

Operationally, it will be seen that the Classics propose a strong central organization, on an international as well as on a national scale. As Trachtenberg says in the introduction to *What Is To Be Done?* (Pet. Ex. 417):

Only a centralized party, working according to a carefully prepared plan, with each member assigned a specific task for which he is to be held accountable, could successfully lead the Russian working class in the struggle against capitalist exploitation and tsarist rule.

Lenin points out that with this, it is necessary for the organization to be composed of professional revolutionists, trained men, that no movement can be durable without a stable organization of leaders to maintain its continuity. The training of cadres is thus basic in the movement (p. 116); and in view of the centralized nature of the organization, leaders and cadres once trained, can be depended upon to keep in touch with the center of the movement and keep it informed of all that transpired by reports.

We conclude that the training of leaders and cadres and the reporting by such leaders to the controlling body of the movement is directed by the Classics.

The position taken by the Classics on the questions of Minorities and Colonials is also basic to the whole movement advocated by Marx and Engels, Lenin and Stalin, particularly the latter two. Any contributions in those directions by their collaborators is no more than

elaboration and amplification of the works of these four. They are implicit in Lenin's definition of imperialism. It will be seen from these and other portions of the Classics that the founders of the movement were not concerned with purely local conditions in Russia. In *Foundations of Leninism*, cited above, it becomes clear (p. 79) that the national problem is part of the general problem of the proletarian revolution to be used for that purpose only to the extent that it is of advantage to such revolution. This also appears from *Strategy and Tactics* (*supra*, pp. 63-65).

We conclude that the Classics contemplate work among Colonials and Minorities to advance the world revolution.

One of the requirements of Marxism-Leninism is conformity. Discipline is considered vital. Deviation from doctrine and practice is not permissible except in local problems in the area of minor tactics. That nondeviation is abjured is patent from *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, pp. 119-21).

The achievement and maintenance of the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible without a party which is strong by reason of its solidarity and iron discipline. But iron discipline in the party is inconceivable without unity of will, without complete and absolute unity of action on the part of all members of the Party.

As stated by Stalin (p. 120), the existence of factions is incompatible either with the party's unity or its iron discipline. He quotes Lenin:

"In the present epoch of acute civil war," says Lenin, "a Communist Party will be able to perform its duty only if it is organized in the most centralized manner, only if iron discipline bordering on military discipline prevails in it, and if its Party centre is a powerful and authoritative organ, wielding wide powers and enjoying the universal confidence of the members of the Party" (*Selected Works*, Vol. X, p. 204).

The penalty for nonconformity is expulsion from the Party (p. 121). (See also *Strategy and Tactics*, Pet. Ex. 343, p. 62.)

We conclude that the Classics require conformity on the part of all organizations and members in the movement and that no deviation from the party line is permitted on penalty of expulsion therefrom.

From the Classics themselves, Marxism-Leninism constitutes an uncodified system of political philosophy and practice which declares that it is inevitable that a classless state of society will be reached through an intermediate stage in which there will be socialist states controlled by dictatorships of the proletariat under the leadership of the Soviet Union. For the attainment of these dictatorships, a hard core of revolutionary zealots is required who operate under exceedingly flexible rules on an international basis. The vehicle for their operation is a so-called political party, the Communist Party, which is provided with strategic and tactical directives. The first objective is to bring to an end capitalistic (bourgeoisie) society. For this purpose, special attention must be paid to labor unions, youth, Minorities and Colonies. Temporary alliances, known as fronts, may be entered into, but always with the ultimate revolutionary goals in view. Capitalism is termed "imperialism." Slogans should be employed in aid of the Party's objectives. "Anti-imperialism" and "peace" are two of the slogans which may be effective. The leader of the movement, which is integrated on an international scale, must be the Soviet Union, which must be protected as the first country in which the dictatorship of the proletariat has been attained. All allegiance is due the Soviet Union as the leader of the vanguard of the proletariat. Force and violence



shall be used to reach objectives if persuasion and guile are ineffective. Where lawful methods are effective, these should be used; where not, unlawful methods should be resorted to. Secrecy, where necessary, should also be used. Discipline must be rigid, though a certain amount of latitude is permissible in local tactical matters, under an organizational structure designated as democratic centralism. This is supposed to be a two-way process but orders emanating from the top, which is the Soviet Union, may not be ignored. Operations are to be on a world-wide basis, including in its sphere, *inter alia*, the United States. Taken on its face, Marxism-Leninism, as it appears in the Classics, is a system under which there is to be a world-wide revolution for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat under the domination and control of the Soviet Union. This revolution is to take place in the various countries as conditions permit. An accepted Marxist-Leninist party is one which is a part of this system.

Subjecting the content of the Classics to further scrutiny in the light of the testimony of the witnesses for both sides, we are better able to reach a determination of the real meaning of Marxism-Leninism. All of the witnesses (except Petitioner's witnesses, Dr. Mosely, Logofet, and Carrington) testified to some knowledge of the Classics and of Marxism-Leninism. They studied it, were taught it, or were subject to it in practice. Admittedly, the Classics have been in use by the members of the CPUSA continuously to the date of the hearings in this proceeding.

Respondent's chief witness concerning Marxism-Leninism was Herbert Aptheker, a teacher at the Jefferson School of Social Science, a school with a general Marxism-Leninism orientation, whom it offers as an expert and who says Marxism-Leninism principles are fundamental to the CPUSA.

Summarized, his testimony is to the effect that Marxism-Leninism is in its inception and thereafter to be found in the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin and others; that its heart is dialectic materialism; that its aim is the end of capitalism and the attainment of a socialist state which will eventually dissolve into Communism; that it is a science, usable in all countries as such and that in this sense it applies to the United States which is an "imperialist" nation; that it only contemplates revolution in the sense of an evolutionary change to rule by the proletariat, and that a dictatorship of the proletariat means rule by that class when that class represents a majority; that its international aspects are only fraternal and represent a similarity of interests of the working class of all countries; that the Classics are used for illumination and for historical background by Communists; that Marxism-Leninism provides a guide for action only as a science would be a guide for a scientific experiment; that it contains no directives and the CPUSA is not controlled or dominated by the Soviet Union thereby; that the name Marxism-Leninism is not used to denote any hidden meaning for the direction of initiatives in the Communist movement.

What is not clear from his testimony is the actual content of Marxism-Leninism and the extent of its applicability to the CPUSA. It is not possible to determine therefrom what portion of the Classics have asserted current validity and how much of Marxism-Leninism is acknowledged to be applicable in any particular place. Moreover,

the credibility of his testimony as a whole is impaired by the inverted outlook it discloses. An example of this appears from his explanation of Lenin's use of Aesopian language (*Imperialism*, Pet. Ex. 140, p. 7) which Lenin said was used to avoid Czarist censorship when the pamphlet was originally written. Aptheker says, as a Marxist-Leninist scholar, that Marxists understood Lenin's use of Aesopian language not in terms of deception; Lenin was not trying to fool anybody, he was trying to illuminate ideas by the use of allegory. This is patently not so, as far as the censors were concerned. It did apply to the initiates of his own party. Again, his insistence that Douglas was right in lying to a court because that court represented what the witness characterized as tyrannical oppressors is indicative of a viewpoint that might permit his conscience to misstate facts if they did not favor his side. His explanation that the American revolution was not in a real sense a revolution because the colonists were oppressed by England casts some doubt on his definitions of revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat. Moreover, these definitions are not in accord with those which appear in the Classics. The evasiveness of Aptheker's testimony, and the distorted viewpoint, indicated above, renders extremely questionable what he says concerning Marxism-Leninism and the Classics and the extent to which they apply to the CPUSA.

Respondent's witness Gates adds little to the meaning to be given to Marxism-Leninism. He says it is a social science. He says that the CPUSA is an independent and completely autonomous organization. Concerning the Classics, he states that while *Problems of Leninism* has been used for teaching in the CPUSA schools, it is taught as historical writing and not as a blueprint or an order for Communists to follow all over the world and that it is not the program of the CPUSA.

Witness Flynn states that the Classics have been and are used in the Party schools as of the date of her testimony (June 26, 1952) but as reference books for history, and for the principles of Marxism-Leninism.

The witnesses for Petitioner,<sup>27</sup> all of whom, as Party members, had some instruction in the meaning of Marxism-Leninism and some of whom were officials, writers or teachers for the Party, agree with Respondent's witnesses only to the extent that one of the component parts of Marxism-Leninism is the philosophic-sociological concept that capitalism must and will inevitably be superseded by a dictatorship of the proletariat which will eventually be succeeded by a stateless class of society known as Communism. This original Marxist doctrine, they state, has superimposed on it the revisions and the supplementations of Lenin, Stalin, Dimitrov, and others which provide it with plans, policies, programs, and directives to bring about the end of the present capitalist era, designated as "imperialism," on a worldwide scale and by any means, including force and violence. The effort to bring about the dictatorship of the proletariat is an integrated effort of the working classes in all countries and the leadership thereof is in the Soviet Union, where it has succeeded.

Witness Lautner states: "The leader of the world Communist movement is the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the

<sup>27</sup> Whose testimony we accept in this connection.



Soviet Union, Joseph Stalin<sup>28</sup> \* \* \*. And the Party he represents." He says adherence to Marxism-Leninism has implicit in it complete subservience on the part of all Communist Party organizations, whether in the United States or elsewhere, and on the part of the individual members in all strategic and most tactical matters, to the rulers of the Soviet Union. The CPUSA adheres to Marxism-Leninism and consequently its Constitution is no more than a bylaw to Marxism-Leninism and has no validity except insofar as it conforms thereto. Petitioner's witness Budenz, a former Party member and Editor of the *Daily Worker* testified, when asked the meaning of the first sentence of the Party's 1945 Constitution (which sentence is identical with the first sentence of the 1948 constitution):

Marxism-Leninism is a well-known and historical term in the Communist documents and discussions. It is that interpretation of so-called scientific socialism based on the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and which holds as the goal of the Communist Parties of the world the necessity for the violent shattering of the bourgeois states in order to set up in their place a completely new state machinery, the dictatorship of the proletariat. This shall be achieved under Marxism-Leninism through the Party of the new type, the Bolshevik Party under Bolshevik discipline, which rejects the concept of class peace (Tr. 11831).

He goes on to state that the Communists in the United States at that time (1945) regarded the American government as a bourgeois state, and that further statements in the Preamble concerning the Communist Party's defense of the United States Constitution were not reconcilable with the sentence above quoted. He goes on to say:

The statements cannot be reconciled. The dedication of Marxism-Leninism is the dedication historically and categorically to the violent shattering of the bourgeois state as the necessary step toward progress, and this other language in the light of that, since Marxism-Leninism principles prevail, is merely a window-dressing for legal protective purpose. It is part of the Aesopian language recommended by Lenin<sup>29</sup> (Tr. 11832).

He states further that the classics were used in his work up to the time he left the party (October 1945). Speaking of his use of Aesopian language, he states:

I referred to Marxism-Leninism. I referred to Stalin as the leader, teacher, and guide, things of that sort, which was Aesopian to the extent that it presented Stalin as the leader, teacher, and guide, but didn't explain that he completely controlled the Communist movement, although I could have done it because Bittelman had stated in Milestones that Stalin was the leader, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union was the leader (Tr. 12263).

He says, concerning Communist activity in the trade-union movement: "No Communist is permitted to deviate from the line set down for the Communists of the world \* \* \*" (Tr. 12267). Petitioner's witness, Lautner, former Party member, leader, and teacher, tells what he was taught concerning the meaning of Marxism-Leninism, and at Tr. 9514, states:

Marxism-Leninism taught us that monopoly capitalism or imperialism was a worldwide phenomenon, therefore there is need of a worldwide organization, an organization that has ties to successfully cope with this problem and eventually bring about the downfall of monopoly capitalism and imperialism.

Further, that the *Program of the Communist International* was used by him in classes in 1947, 1948, and 1949 "because the program of the

<sup>28</sup> The record discloses no basis for any inference that the death of Stalin will terminate, lessen, or otherwise affect the domination of Respondent by the U. S. S. R.

<sup>29</sup> For a definition of "Aesopian," see *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism* (Pet. Ex. 140, p. 7, n. 1).

Communist International lays down the strategic aims of the Communist Parties."

Another witness for Petitioner, Meyer, said he taught Marxism-Leninism in Respondent's schools and that it was a body of doctrine which is first a philosophy of history, secondly, a guide to the Communist Party on the basis of that philosophy, in carrying out its historical role which is the overthrow of the capitalist system and its replacement with a dictatorship of the proletariat to establish socialism which is to lead to the stage of Communism. Petitioner's witness, Philbrick, states he was taught this, and that the lessons of Marxism-Leninism were to be applied to present-day affairs as a guide to action.

The witnesses for the Petitioner aver that the Classics represent a body of living doctrine and directives by which the Communists throughout the world are guided and governed. Witness Meyer testified that the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* was used as a living guide to revolutionary action based on the experience of the Bolsheviks and the writings of Lenin and Stalin. He points to a speech by Trachtenberg made in Washington, D. C., in 1949, which declares that the leaders must know the Classics and be able to apply the basic principles to any current situation at any time. Witness Matusow says, by way of example of current applicability of the Classics that the *Communist Manifesto*, though 100 years old, "is just as relevant today as it was in 1848 when it was written." He goes on to say that this was so of other pieces of Marxist literature, pointing out particularly *The Young Generation* by Lenin, written in 1905 and used extensively in the Labor Youth League in 1949. The Classics were in use by the CPUSA, to his knowledge, as of December 1950 (tr. 11032-33). Witness Evans says the Classics were used in the Marxist-Leninist Institute from April 1949 to June 1950. Witness Budenz testified that Trachtenberg, head of the cultural commission in charge of the direction of Communist cultural activities and in charge of the Party's general publishing field, stated he was not permitted to issue any Marxist literature, especially the Classics, without the authorization of the Marx Institute in Moscow. The *Daily Worker* used the Classics in its work. He states that Dennis recommended:

A thorough return throughout the Party to the Marxist-Leninist Classics, particularly to the writings of Stalin, the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, *Foundations of Leninism*, and Dimitrov's Report to the Seventh Congress, which dealt with the true nature of how to conduct the United Front while forwarding the Communist revolutionary aims (tr. 11812).

While writing for the *Daily Worker* (from 1935 to 1945), Budenz did not directly advocate the overthrow of the government by force and violence. This was done by reference to Marxism-Leninism and the Classics. Witness Lautner testified that on the basis of the Classics, at the National Training School in 1941, he was taught how Lenin applied Marxism to the epoch of imperialism and established a party of a new type; how Stalin applied this to the party as a force, the leading political party of the working class; that Marxism-Leninism was a guide to action in the party in the United States; that the aim of the party was to gain political and economic power in this country and that this was to be accomplished, on the basis of Marxism-Leninism, by a worldwide organization.



From the Classics themselves, it is clear that force and violence was deemed necessary for the overthrow of the government of the Czars by the Russians. It is also clear that they call for international action by the working class in other countries so that Russia, when freed from the Czars would not be left standing in a hostile bourgeois world alone and friendless. The Classics definitely call for action on an international scale. It is the contention of the Respondent that the call to aid the Soviet Union was only applicable when the Soviet Union was weak and struggling; now that it is strong, such international action on her behalf is not necessary. Is this so? It is clear that, in the period of the Communist International, the Classics were admittedly meant to be applied as the basic law of all Communist Parties, in every country where such parties existed. Under this basic law, the Soviet Union was the leader of a world organization of all such Communist Parties, in a worldwide movement to emancipate the working class from capitalist rule, so the directives, programs, and policies by which this was to be accomplished were clearly set forth in such Classics. Deviation therefrom was considered heresy and not to be tolerated.

While Marxism-Leninism is allegedly dynamic, there is no internal evidence in the portion of this amorphous amalgam which has been reduced to writing, and has become known as the Classics, which indicates a change in its character to make it inapplicable to the CPUSA. On the contrary, Petitioner's witnesses have established that the Classics are in current use and are applicable to the Party. Dr. Aptheker admits that no CPUSA member has altered the fundamental precepts of Marxism-Leninism.

We find the testimony of the witnesses for Petitioner, concerning Marxism-Leninism credible and in accord with the meaning thereof to be obtained from a reading of the record as a whole.

We find that the testimony of the witnesses for the Respondent concerning Marxism-Leninism is in and of itself, and in the context of the record as a whole, unrealistic, apologetic rather than explanatory, and not credible, except as to the origins of Marxism-Leninism and, generally speaking, that its objectives are the attainment of a socialist state under a dictatorship of the proletariat and an eventual classless state of society known as Communism.

How Marxism-Leninism is understood, used, and followed, by Respondent has been established in the discussion of the testimony of the witnesses, above. In addition thereto, consideration has been given to the numerous exhibits which shed light on the above question. From them it further appears that Respondent, its leaders, and its members taught, studied, discussed, used, and applied the Classics in the manner intended by the authors of these Classics and to an extent incompatible with any claim that the Classics are not binding upon them in all fundamentals.

One of the most important, if not the most important, of the Classics in the period under examination in this proceeding, is the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* (Pet.

Ex. 330).<sup>30</sup> A resolution, adopted August 10, 1939, signed by the Communist Parties of France, Great Britain, the United States, Germany, and Italy (Pet. Ex. 296), states, *inter alia* (p. 73):

The appearance of the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* is one of the greatest events in the life of the Communist world movement and of the international labor movement, in the struggle of the working people of all countries for emancipation. Written with the immediate participation of Comrade Stalin and authorized by the Central Committee of the C. P. S. U. (B.), the *History* occupies an extraordinary place among the classic works of Marxism-Leninism. The *History* is intended to play—and will undoubtedly play—a very important role in the successful mastering of Bolshevism by the Communists of the capitalist countries, in the consolidation of the Sections of the Communist International, and in raising their ideological and political level.

A reading of the exhibit as a whole is enlightening concerning the use of the Classics advocated by Respondent and the position they are given in the propagation of Marxism-Leninism. At page 83 it states:

(g) The work of the publishing houses is to be so organized that, besides the contemporary agitational literature, they not only publish the works of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, but also strive to achieve for them the very widest distribution.

Not only are the Classics given wide distribution but they are also integral in the teachings and activities of the Respondent.<sup>31</sup>

Consequently, we conclude that the classics are one of the chief means by which the CPSU directs, dominates, and controls the CPUSA.

From a review of the classics and of the testimony, we make the following findings concerning Marxism-Leninism as it is understood, used, and followed by respondent:

Marxism-Leninism is a composite of the doctrines, dogmas, and guides to action of Marx and Engels, as supplemented and revised by Lenin, Stalin, and others, which advocates a worldwide revolutionary movement. The objective of the movement is the destruction of capitalism (which it designates as "imperialism"). It asserts as its ultimate goal a stateless class of society which it designates as "communism." The first step toward this end is the attainment of a socialist state under a dictatorship of the proletariat. "Proletariat" generally is synonymous with "working class." But "a dictatorship of the proletariat" connotes the rule by a minority in the name of the working class. Such a dictatorship should, theoretically, come about

<sup>30</sup> Witness Meyer's testimony on this point (Tr. 5554) is sufficiently significant to warrant quotation here: "The WITNESS. The fundamental textbooks used before the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union appeared—that must have appeared late in 1939, but I can't date it exactly. I can date it by epoch. It appeared during that general 1939 to 1940 epoch, but I think it appeared in late 1939 or it might have been early 1940. At any rate before that appeared the major textbooks used, at the core of the whole problem—there were others used but the essential ones always were the Communist Manifesto of Marx and Foundations of Leninism, by Stalin. The whole course of Marxism-Leninism was organized around these two. Then, so to speak, radiating from them were special problems: Lenin's State and Revolution, Lenin's Imperialism, Stalin's Problems of Leninism. I should say these were the central ones, except at one point also, I think in the earlier part of this period primarily, there were three rather widely used textbooks of excerpts from the writings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin. One was called Strategy and Tactics, another the Theory of the Proletarian Revolution, and another one the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. After the History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union appeared it became the Central Textbook."

<sup>31</sup> Some of the instances of the use of various of the more important classics in evidence appears from the following exhibits which refer to study outlines, reading lists, school curricula, sales lists of Marxist literature and advertisements. It should be noted that these represent use of the items in years 1948 and 1949 and 1950. *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121) Pet. Exs. 339, 346, 351, 369, 370, 416, 419, 420, 424, 425, 427; *Problems of Leninism*: Stalin (Pet. Ex. 138) Pet. Exs. 370, 416, 419; *State and Revolution*: Lenin (Pet. Ex. 139) Pet. Exs. 346, 370, 424; *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*: Lenin (Pet. Ex. 140) Pet. Exs. 339, 346, 369, 370, 419, 425, 427; *Communist Manifesto*: Marx and Engels (Pet. Ex. 31) Pet. Exs. 339, 351, 369, 370, 420, 424; *The Theory of the Proletarian Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 422) Pet. Exs. 419, 425, 427; *The United Front: The Struggle Against Fascism and War* (Pet. Ex. 149) Pet. Exs. 346, 420, 424, 427; *Theses and Statutes of the Third (Communist) International* (Pet. Ex. 8) Pet. Ex. 7; *Mastering Bolshevism*: Stalin (Pet. Ex. 335) Pet. Exs. 370, 416; *What Is To Be Done?* (Pet. Ex. 417) Pet. Exs. 346, 370, 416, 420, 424.



by a nonviolent revolution which would evolve from natural economic change. Actually, Marxism-Leninism requires that such revolution be hastened by action. This action must be taken by a dedicated group of revolutionaries, banded together as a so-called political party: the Communist Party. Under the leadership of the Soviet Union, this Party shall bring about, by force and violence if necessary, dictatorship of the proletariat in every country of the world whenever circumstances shall permit. Marxism-Leninism includes within itself the plans and procedures to accomplish this end. Adherence to its principles involves acceptance of its doctrines, tenets, and obligations; and membership in the world revolutionary movement mentioned above. Marxism-Leninism contemplates the Communist Party of the United States as part of the world Communist movement. The name "Marxism-Leninism" is frequently applied in an esoteric sense to conceal from the uninitiated the full implications of such adherence and membership.

We proceed to examine the record as to Respondent's basic policies and activities to determine the extent to which they are formulated and carried out pursuant to Marxism-Leninism as hereinbefore defined; the extent to which such policies and activities reflect compliance in their formation and execution with other directives or instructions of the Soviet Union; and, the extent to which such policies and activities have as their purpose the furtherance of the policies of the Soviet Union and the advancement of the objectives of the world Communist movement. We treat first with the voluminous evidence concerning what Respondent and other Communist Parties throughout the world Communist movement constantly term the "struggle against imperialism", and with Respondent's participation in such "struggle".

### 3. *Imperialism*

The record establishes and we find that among the major activities of Respondent are teaching, advocacy, and agitation in opposition to what Respondent calls United States imperialism. This includes programs and activities such as "the struggle for peace"; the doctrine of "just and unjust wars"; the theory that the world is divided into two hostile camps, one led by the Soviet Union and the other by the United States; and the necessity of overthrowing existing "imperialist" governments by force and violence if necessary.

The record further establishes, and therefore we find, that a basic objective of the Soviet Union and of the world Communist movement is to bring about the downfall of the so-called "imperialist" countries, including the United States, believing that, in so doing, several coveted objectives will be achieved: protecting and defending the Soviet Union, establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat in the various countries, centralizing of all power—political, economic, and social—in the Communist Parties.

Upon consideration of the evidence hereinafter summarized and upon the entire record, we further find and conclude that respondent's teachings, advocacy, and agitation as above stated have as their objective and purpose the advancement of the world Communist movement; and they are formulated and carried out on the basis of Marxism-Leninism and other directives and instructions from the Soviet Union. We proceed to review the more significant evidence establishing the foregoing findings.

Respondent's witness Dr. Aptheker says there never was a period when the Communists of the United States ceased to characterize the United States Government as "imperialist," and that the United States, with its social system and ruling class, fits the definition of "imperialism" as given by Lenin and as adopted by Respondent. Typical of Respondent's position in this respect is the following quotation from an article appearing in the January 1951 issue of *Political Affairs*:

\* \* \* U. S. imperialism is the most reactionary force in the world today, seeking to fascize, not only America, but every capitalist country (Pet. Ex. 378, p. 9).

Additional illustration is furnished by an article by Betty Gannett published in the February 1951 issue of *Political Affairs* (Pet. Ex. 376, pp. 183-194) which emphasizes that the United States is imperialist and is plotting a new world war (p. 186); that "one of the main pillars of U. S. imperialism is its anti-Sovietism" (p. 189), whereas the Soviet Union is for peace, is not an aggressor, and, being a workers' state, cannot and does not pursue an imperialist course (p. 190). The oral and documentary evidence establishes convincingly that Respondent has consistently characterized the United States as an "imperialist" nation. This fact, standing alone, is not disputed on the record.

We proceed to review the evidence and make our findings concerning why Respondent teaches, advocates, and agitates against what it calls American imperialism. The *Communist Manifesto* (Pet. Ex. 31, p. 9) declares that society as a whole is splitting into two great hostile camps, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. Lenin in *Imperialism* (Pet. Ex. 140, pp. 9, 11, 126) designates capitalism as "imperialism" and predicts a proletarian victorious revolution after the impending imperialist war; the United States is designated as "imperialist." In *State and Revolution* (Pet. Ex. 139, p. 6), Lenin explains in the preface that the Russian Revolution of 1917 "can be understood in its totality only as a link in the chain of Socialist proletarian revolutions called forth by the imperialist war." Stalin in *Foundations of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 121, p. 15) develops the idea further to show that "imperialism" has made the revolution inevitable and has provided favorable conditions for it. In *Problems of Leninism* (Pet. Ex. 138, p. 9), he indicates that Leninism provides "suitable and obligatory" theory and tactics for the proletarian revolution against "imperialism".

In 1927, the Communist International issued a *Resolution On The American Question* (Pet. Ex. 43) which states that "The United States of America, during the last decade, has developed into the mightiest imperialist power" (p. 1); and, that the task of the Communist Party is "to form a broad united front and to intensify the struggle against American imperialism" (p. 1). The *Resolution* lists the policy of the United States in China and its attitude against the Soviet Union among the questions that "must" be utilized by the Party to rally the broad masses in defense of the Soviet Union and in its struggle against American imperialism (pp. 2-3).

The evidence summarized above is illustrative of a quantity of evidence which establishes that it is fundamental to Marxism-Leninism and to the world Communist movement led by the Soviet Union that all countries other than those of a victorious socialist revolution — which encompasses only the Soviet Union and those brought within



its orbit—are characterized as “imperialist,” against which the Communist Parties must wage the “struggle against imperialism.”

In addition to the voluminous documentary evidence of record, Respondent's continuous adherence to these fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism and of the world Communist movement is established by the testimony of Petitioner's witnesses based upon their experiences as members and officials of Respondent; upon directions they received while in the Party and the instruction they gave as teachers in the Party; and upon their study of official Party publications. The more significant oral testimony is summarized as herinafter set forth.

While Petitioner's witness Gitlow was a high officer of Respondent, until 1929, its aims and purposes were: to defend the Soviet Union as the fatherland of the working class of the world; to carry out the orders and directives of the Communist International; and to work for the undermining of the foundations of the American Government in order to make it possible for Respondent to overthrow our form of government and set up in its place a dictatorship patterned after that which operates in the Soviet Union today.

In 1932, Petitioner's witness Kornfeder, a former leading official of Respondent, taught in a school at the Party headquarters that the main doctrine of Lenin called for the complete and total overthrow of all existing social institutions, the government, the existing organizations that support the government, the complete elimination of the present state structure and its replacement by a dictatorship led by Respondent.

Petitioner's witness Nowell was taught at the Lenin School in Moscow in 1932, and subsequently he himself taught in Respondent's schools in 1933 and 1934 in the United States, that the Government of the United States was the executive committee of the capitalist class in the United States and was subject to the same Marxism-Leninism laws of growth, development, and decay as all capitalist states; that the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat were necessary and equally as inevitable in the United States as in other capitalist countries; that it was the duty of the Communists to work for the overthrow of the Government of the United States and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, following the form of the Soviet, and under the hegemony of Respondent and the Communist International; and, that it was the necessary duty of Respondent, as a part of world Communism, to work for the overthrow of the other “imperialist” nations.

Petitioner's witness Meyer taught in Respondent's schools until near the end of 1945. He instructed the members of Respondent that Marxism-Leninism is a guide to Respondent in carrying out its *historical role or mission* to overthrow the capitalist system and political states founded on the capitalist system; to destroy the economic organization on which that society is founded and its political system, and to replace it with the dictatorship of the proletariat, to establish the kind of socialism that will lead to Communism.

Petitioner's witness Johnson was taught at Respondent's training school in about 1932 that it was the duty of the Communists to build themselves up to the position where they could challenge the power of the government, and that the Red Army would not hesitate to throw its weight into the scales to tip the balance in favor of the

Communist revolutionists in America; also, that the Communists should agitate and work for the demoralization of the Armed Forces of the United States by convincing them that they must refuse to fight against the Soviet Red Army and go over on the side of the Red Army using their guns against the Government of the United States and all the forces that remained loyal to it. This was the policy of Respondent throughout Johnson's membership, until 1940, and was elaborated upon by such leaders as Foster, Bedacht, Bittelman, Browder, and Stachel, at committee meetings and conventions. It is significant that Foster is the present national chairman of Respondent and some of these others are still high officials (see pp. 20 to 21 herein).

Petitioner's witness Lautner who was a member of Respondent until 1950, and Petitioner's witness Janowitz who was a member at the time of testifying in this proceeding, corroborate this evidence.

Petitioner's witness Matusow stated the aims and objectives of Respondent in case of a war between the United States and the Soviet Union were not to support the American "imperialists." The establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the United States would have to be accomplished by violent means because "the ruling class would not give up its power." While in the Party (1947 to 1951), he did not hear or see anything to indicate a change in the aims of Respondent. He refers to a statement of Izzy Brown, Club Education Director of the Friedlander Youth Club in New York in 1948, that it was the policy of Respondent not to support the United States in an "imperialist war" against the Soviet Union.

Petitioner's witness Scarletto relates a discussion in the latter part of 1950 by Party members in which it was felt advisable that members go into the service of the United States in the Korean War because they would be in a position to sabotage the United States effort. At a meeting about the middle of November 1950, of functionaries of the Mexican Concentration Club, a suggestion was made to raise money through a neutral country for the North Koreans. The chairman of the Club at a meeting in the latter part of 1950, told witness Scarletto that it would be a good idea if he went back into the Navy Air Corps where he would have a good opportunity to sabotage. At a meeting of a Party club about December 1, 1950, the chairman reported American officers had been killed by their Korean orderlies. There were several expressions of satisfaction over this and the report that the war was going against the Americans at the time.

Petitioner's witness Evans, a member of Respondent from 1948 to 1952, was taught that in a war between the Soviet Union and the United States all members of Respondent should help defeat the predatory aims of imperialism.<sup>32</sup>

In the years between 1945 and 1950, Petitioner's witnesses Cummings, Hidalgo, Blane, Markward, and Baldwin were taught that the world was divided into two camps: the imperialists and the anti-imperialists (democracies); that Russia was anti-imperialist and democratic; that the wars of the imperialists were unjust wars and the wars of the anti-imperialists were just wars; that in a war between imperialists and anti-imperialists, the members of the CPUSA must

<sup>32</sup> The organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in March 1950 stated that while imperialism exists there also exists the danger of new aggression and that in the presence of imperialism and its predatory plans wars are unavoidable (*Pravda*, Pet. Ex. 217).



aid the anti-imperialists; and that this would hold true in the case of a war between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Documentary evidence of Respondent's expressions confirms the oral testimony that Respondent's policy is to oppose many United States policies and activities as imperialists, and as aggressive against the Soviet Union; also, that Respondent's policy is to support the Soviet Union and defeat the aims of imperialism. *Political Affairs* for March 1951 describes President Truman's activities as "imperialism" on the way to bankruptcy and as a provocative semimobilization for an outright war against the Soviet Union.

A pattern throughout the world Communist movement for teaching, advocating, and agitating for the overthrow of "imperialist" governments exists in the concept or slogan that the world is divided into two hostile camps, one led by the Soviet Union and the other by the United States. As previously herein set forth, Lenin, Stalin, and the Communist International, in interpreting and adapting to the world Communist movement the writings of Marx and Engels, took the original concept that society is divided between the bourgeoisie and proletariat, and developed it into the doctrine or slogan that the world is divided into two hostile camps—the camp of the imperialist states and the camp of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the USSR. In the *Programme of The Communist International* (Pet. Ex. 125) this is explained as follows:

The difference in class structure and in the class character of the government in the two camps, the fundamental differences in the aims each pursues in internal, foreign, economic, and cultural policy, the fundamentally different courses of their development, brings the capitalist world into sharp conflict with the victorious proletariat State. \* \* \* The class struggle, which hitherto was conducted in circumstances when the proletariat was not in possession of State power, is now being conducted on an enormous and really world scale; the working class of the world has now its own State—the one and only fatherland of the international proletariat \* \* \* (pp. 24 and 25).

\* \* \* \* \*

Thus, as a result of the first round of imperialist wars a new, fundamental antagonism has arisen of world historical scope and significance; the antagonism between the U. S. S. R. and the capitalist world (p. 25).

The record establishes a consistent advancement of this doctrine or slogan by the Soviet Union and by the Communist Information Bureau, and its acceptance and use by Respondent. Of late, the slogan of "peace" has been added as hereinafter covered.

The Soviet Union in January 1949 characterized the postwar foreign policy of the United States and Great Britain as one of aggression and unleashing a new war for world domination, whereas, it stated, the Soviet Union struggles for universal peace and international security. This position of the Soviet Union as reported in *Pravda*, points out that "The very existence of the Soviet State, with its growing power and its international authority, and likewise the powerful support given to it by the democratic forces in other countries constitute an insurmountable barrier in the way of all plans of any kind for the establishment of world domination by one power or another." (Pet. Ex. 251, p. 19).

*Pravda* for March 11, 1950 (Pet. Ex. 217), contains a speech by V. M. Molotov which states that "Since the October Revolution in our country, the victory of the national liberation movement in China appears as a new and most powerful blow at the entire system of world imperialism and at all plans of imperialist aggression in our

time" (p. 4), and "Now the Soviet Union has not only come out of international isolation but is also the center of the powerful international democratic camp. \* \* \* In the capitalist countries themselves, we now have millions of active friends who are closing ranks more and more in a broad democratic, anti-imperialist movement." (p. 5) \* \* \* "*The democratic camp*, which unites the USSR and the countries of the people's democracy, is opposed by the camp of the imperialist powers, headed by the ruling circles of the United States of America" (p. 6). [Emphasis added.]

*For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* issue of November 10, 1947, sets forth a speech delivered by A. Zhdanov<sup>33</sup> at the Informative Conference of the Nine Communist Parties held in Poland at the end of September 1947. A section of this speech is entitled: "The New Post-War Alignment of Political Forces and the Formation of Two Camps: the Imperialist and the Anti-Democratic Camp, and the Anti-Imperialist and Democratic One" wherein it is stated the principal driving force of the imperialist camp is the United States with whom Great Britain and France are allied; the second camp—anti-imperialist—is based on the USSR and the "new democracies" (Pet. Ex. 214-A).

*For a Lasting Peace*, issue of March 10, 1950, contains an article which concludes with the following:

A comparison of the economic successes achieved by the Peoples' Democracies in a very short period of their history with the extremely difficult position of the working people in the capitalist countries constitutes a terrible indictment of American imperialism and of the whole decaying capitalist system (Pet. Ex. 412, p. 1).

With respect to Respondent, when Petitioner's witness Lautner left the Party at the end of 1949, the Party line was that the United States headed the imperialist forces of the world and that Russia led the anti-imperialist forces and that everything should be done to aid Russia and to disconcert the United States. Further, in 1949 an instructor in courses on the ABC's of Marxism included the United States in the imperialist camp and a similar position was taken by a Party study group in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1948, where it was stated that the United States led the "imperialists" and the Soviet Union led the anti-imperialists or Peoples' Democracies.

A "Discussion Outline" on "The Marxist Position Toward War" issued by Respondent's Educational Department, Michigan State Committee, in April 1949 (Pet. Ex. 400) has a section entitled, "IV. World War II was Just War" which says in part:

The post-war world was split by the U. S. and Britain into two camps—the camp of imperialism and fascism under the leadership of American imperialism and the camp of democracy, national freedom and peace, headed by the U S S R (p. 4).

Similar teachings by Respondent are evidenced by study and teaching material used in various schools and groups (Pet. Ex. 425, p. 16; Pet. Ex. 424, Sess. 9).

Related to the concept of the world being divided into two hostile camps, is the concept or slogan set forth by Lenin and Stalin that distinguishes between "just wars," which are those carried on by "anti-imperialist" nations; and "unjust wars," i.e., those engaged in

<sup>33</sup> The Zhdanov Report has recently been widely used and followed by Respondent. It was published in *Political Affairs* and discussed and studied throughout the Party while Lautner and Philbrick were members. It is variously listed as "required reading," "reading material," and "reading," in study and teaching materials used by Respondent in 1949.



solely by "imperialist" nations among themselves or against any "socialist" country, such as the Soviet Union. We find that the concept of "just" and "unjust" wars, requiring the Communist Parties to support the Soviet Union in a war between the Soviet Union and any other country, and in a war between the Soviet Union and their own country to use every means to assist the Soviet Union, is basic to Marxism-Leninism; and that it has been continuously advanced and advocated by the Soviet Union, and has been continuously taught and followed by Respondent. Respondent's policies and activities centering around the doctrine of "just" and "unjust" wars is covered later in this report in connection with the issue as to what country the leaders of Respondent consider they owe allegiance. Accordingly, it is sufficient at this point to state our finding that Respondent's teachings and advocacy of this line represent a continued following of directions as to the line from Marxism-Leninism, the Communist International, and the Soviet Union.

We proceed to review the evidence concerning Respondent's use of the words "peace" and "democracy" in connection with the struggle against "imperialism" and for the advancement of the aims and objectives of the world Communist movement. Earlier in this report we have reviewed the united-front tactic as set forth in Marxism-Leninism as one of the means used for establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat. The united front has taken various approaches throughout the period since 1919. In the interest of reasonable summarization of the record, we limit this report to the use of the united-front tactic from 1935 on.

In 1935, the Communist International, with Respondent represented, mapped out the "tactical line" for the years ahead which consisted of forming a "united front" with other organizations in order to achieve national unity in the various countries for the purpose of combatting fascism.<sup>34</sup> The record shows that early in the 1930's, Stalin, in a report on behalf of the Central Committee of the CPSU to its Party Congress, pointed out that "the bourgeoisie would seek a way out of the economic crisis, on the one hand, by crushing the working class through the establishment of fascist dictatorship, i. e., the dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic, most imperialistic capitalist elements" (Pet. Ex. 330, pp. 300-301). The record also shows that the Soviet Union realized a "second imperialist war" represented a serious danger to the USSR. (Pet. Ex. 330, pp. 334-5). In mid-1935, discussions were started in the Communist International on the matter of the united front—the "anti-Fascist front"—which were supported by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as evidenced by an article in the August 6, 1935, issue of *Pravda*; this points out that "Unity—that is the command of the movement!" and emphasizes "that this unity be directed against Fascism, against the danger of a new imperialist war, against the offensive of capital," while also emphasizing that the Communists "know that only the dictatorship of the proletariat, only the Soviet Government is the sole salvation of the working class \* \* \*" (Pet. Ex. 183).

Thus, it is more than a coincidence that the Communist International in 1935 gave among the reasons for developing the "new

<sup>34</sup> In Communist documents, fascism is a form of imperialism.

tactical orientation," the economic crisis facing capitalism, the offensive of fascism, and the growth of the threat of a new imperialist war and of an attack on the U. S. S. R. (Pet. Ex. 137, pp. 21-22). In a speech at the close of this meeting of the Comintern, Georgi Dimitrov pointed out that "Ours is a Congress of struggle for the preservation of peace, against the threat of imperialist war"<sup>35</sup> (*ibid*, p. 8), and that:

Standing firmly on the impregnable position of Marxism-Leninism, which has been confirmed by the entire experience of the international labor movement, and primarily by the victories of the great October Revolution, our Congress, acting in the spirit and guided by the method of living Marxism-Leninism, has reshaped the tactical lines of the Communist International to meet the changed world situation (*ibid*, p. 11).

The Resolution of the Comintern concerning the new approach or use of the united-front tactic lays down various things which the Communist Parties are to do in carrying out the revised line, and in that connection uses such words as "enjoins" (p. 26), "must" (p. 36), and "imperative" (p. 37). The record shows that Respondent fully and completely complied with this line laid down by the Communist International as evidenced by the following, which is among the more significant evidence of record on this point.

In November 1935 the Central Committee of Respondent adopted a resolution "fully and wholeheartedly" endorsing the decisions of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International in which resolution the "chief task" of Respondent at the time is stated to be "to reorientate the work of the Party in accord with the tactical line of the Seventh World Congress" and in which "The Central Committee calls upon the party organizations and every Party member to prosecute the struggle for the united front with the utmost determination and flexibility in the *new way* pointed out by the Seventh World Congress" (emphasized in text) (Pet. Ex. 185, pp. 1182-1184). Like the resolution of the Comintern and the statements of the Soviet Union, Respondent's resolution takes care to point out that the line is an application "in a living way" of "the teachings of Marx, Lenin, Engels, and Stalin"; and that it is linked to the prosecution of the Party's "revolutionary aims" and "revolutionary principles and program" (*ibid*, p. 1185).

Some of the details of Respondent's compliance with the instructions of the Communist International are furnished by Petitioner's witness Nowell who in the latter part of 1935 was instructed by William Weinstone and other functionaries of the Michigan District of Respondent to proceed to set up certain organizations in accordance with the united front policy and conforming to the new type of reorientation, as set forth in the resolutions of the Comintern. The witness shows that he carried out these instructions by forming fractions in various organizations for the purpose of influencing the policies of the organizations and to guide them along the lines of the Communist Party in setting up the "united front" movement.

In 1936, Respondent's Central Committee issued a statement which was printed in Respondent's magazine, *The Communist*, issue for May 1936, calling upon all workers to unite to defeat fascism and on May Day to pledge to defend the Soviet Union. *The Communist*

<sup>35</sup> The speech of Dimitrov and the Resolutions adopted by the Comintern were printed in pamphlet form in the United States by Workers Library Publishers and have been widely used by Respondent.



for May 1940 carries an article by "Gene Dennis" which points out the danger to the Soviet Union from the imperialist war and states that the united front can only be achieved successfully if consistently directed against the imperialist war and capitalist reaction.

Some aspects of Respondent's line during the period of the second world war shifted back and forth to follow the position of the Soviet Union. The pertinent facts in this respect are covered in our findings under the section of this report on the issue of nondeviation; we have taken them into consideration as part of the pertinent evidence involving Respondent's following of foreign directions concerning the use of the united front tactic. The record shows that after World War II, the use of the united front tactic received a different emphasis in the form of the united front for "peace." The testimony of Petitioner's witness Lautner, which is corroborated by other evidence of record, furnishes a clear understanding of this aspect of the issues and is therefore pertinent for review in some detail. The witness testified in part as follows, which we find to be an accurate statement of the facts:

The United Front tactics of the Communist Party were part of the subject matter of Marxism-Leninism, and in class [referring to Party classes in 1948] we tried to convey the idea that the Seventh World Congress decisions pertaining to the United Front tactics and Dimitrov's report in no way eliminated or negated the decisions of the Sixth World Congress but implemented the decisions of the Sixth World Congress in a way to enable the Party to develop a wider base on specific issues. Before the Seventh World Congress we had United Fronts that were based on a narrow concept popularly known as United Front from Below, United Fronts on specific issues, but were elements that were ready and willing to work on specific issues with the Communist movement. In the main it was an effort to increase and to advance the influence of the Communist Parties. This policy, based on the strategy and tactics of the Sixth World Congress, was a failure of the Party in Germany to make headway, the defeat suffered by the German Party, based on the strategy and tactics and the program of the Sixth World Congress, the failure in China, the failure to build the Red International Trade Union movement, the failure to gain a way or win a way to working classes, the organized section of the working classes from the influence of social democracy, with the result that reaction gained power in a number of countries. Hitler came to power in Germany. The Seventh World Congress devised a new tactical approach in order to achieve the main strategic objectives by developing a program of United Front from below and from above, and also the program of the people's fronts and coalitions around a specific issue in the struggle against fascism and in the struggle against war, because fascism was the main danger of war at that time.

\* \* \* \* \*

So The United Front is not a repudiation of the basis [sic] strategic aims of the Communist movement, but as step that will bring closer the realization of that strategic aim.

\* \* \* \* \*

After 1945 there came a re-evaluation of the world situation. Now the problem was to find that link in the chain again with which a new coalition could be developed on a united front basis, on a minimum program, on a partial program of the Communist International, with which coalition we could go forward to a new milestone, to a new point and gain new adherents to the Communist movement, and when we reached that milestone there would be a new situation, a new realignment of forces; and we would find that new link with which we could go forward again. *This link after the second world war was the struggle for peace.* The question of peace was the new link. At the reconstitution convention Foster in his report already indicated the direction in which the Party will travel in this postwar period, and Zhdanov's report later on precisely sets the two world camps and the main issue in the coming period, the issue of peace. That is the new link today around which the Party develops its activities to broaden out and to bring about an alignment of forces on the basis on which it can extend its

influence and exert its influence among a broader section of the population of this country (Tr. 9543-46). [Italic added.]

The record clearly shows that the Communist Parties throughout the world, including the Respondent in the United States, are now actively and strongly presenting the line of "peace," particularly the united front in the "struggle for peace." The very name of the official organ of the Communist Information Bureau, which is *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*, is indicative thereof. Key material used by Respondent in forming its "peace" line is the Zhdanov report, previously mentioned (see p. 49 and footnote 3), from which a typical quotation is as follows:

All the forces of the anti-imperialist and anti-fascist camp are united in the effort to secure a just and democratic peace. \* \* \* These countries, and in the first place the new democracies \* \* \* have proved themselves in the postwar period staunch defenders of peace, democracy and their own liberty and independence against all attempts on the part of the United States and Great Britain to turn them back in their course and to bring them again under the imperialist yoke (Pet. Ex. 214-A, p. 2).

The position or line of the Soviet Union in this matter is evidenced by a report delivered by G. M. Malenkov at the meeting of the Moscow Soviet in November 1949 and printed in the November 11, 1949 issue of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*. In this report, Malenkov devoted a substantial portion to the heading "The Soviet Union Stands for Peace and Defends the Cause of Peace" (Pet. Ex. 231, p. 1). He points out that there is not a single country in which the movement uniting the supporters of peace does not possess a "base" (p. 2) and that the successes of "the camp of peace" drives the "enemies of peace," "by means of violence and new wars," to attempt the creation of an American world empire designed to turn the whole world into a "colony of the American imperialists, of reducing sovereign peoples to a state of slavery."

The December 1951 issue of *Political Affairs* contains a condensed translation from the Soviet philosophical journal *Voprosi Filosofie* which is entitled: "Stalin on the War Danger and the Possibility of Averting It." This Soviet statement, which by its publication in *Political Affairs* and in view of the entire record, makes it reasonable to conclude that it was adopted by Respondent and thus becomes the line of Respondent and is very similar in content to the above-mentioned Zhdanov and Malenkov reports. The statement outlines various forms which "the struggle for peace" has taken, such as fighting for an end to the war in Korea, against rearming West Germany and Japan, and a ban on atomic weapons. It also quotes with approval a declaration by Joseph Stalin in 1946 to the effect that "the peoples" are taking the fate of their states in their own hands and establishing "democratic regimes" and "carrying on an active struggle against the forces of reaction, against the incendiaries of a new war" (Pet. Ex. 488, p. 20).

Respondent's following of the line of the united front, and particularly the united front for peace, is evidenced by a quantity of documentary material probative of Respondent's policies and doctrines. Typical recent expressions of this line by Respondent appear in the *Daily Worker* issues of March 3, 1949, June 9, 1950, July 13, 1950, September 18, 1950, February 19, 1951, April 1, 1951, October 19,



1951, November 7, 1951, and June 9, 1952. The issue of November 7, 1950, contains the following as part of an editorial:

Today the Soviet Union is indestructible.—The work of Lenin and Stalin is immortal. The Socialist State has become the leader of a new force in modern history—the great camp of peace. This new alliance of hundreds of millions of people in China and the People's Democracies, together with the vast millions in the colonial and capitalist countries, can prevent war. This is the new achievement of the Soviet Union, the glorious vision that the people can make a reality (Pet. Ex. 468).

Recent indications of Respondent's following of this united front for peace line also appear in *Political Affairs* for November 1950, February 1951, April 1951, December 1951, and January 1952. The issue of February 1951 (Pet. Ex. 376) contains "greetings" from Communist Parties of some thirty countries sent to Respondent on the occasion of its 15th National Convention. These greetings condemn American imperialism and support the struggle for peace. The "greetings" from the Soviet Union says in part: "May the international solidarity of the toilers in the struggle for peace, democracy, and Socialism gather strength," The People's Democratic Republic of China advised Respondent: "As a result of common struggle of the people of the world and awakened people in the United States, American imperialism has met with huge defeats and will continue to meet with even bigger defeats." The French Party pointed out that Respondent's decisions "taken in the light of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, will enable you to advance forward on the road of unity of action of the working class." The Italian Party stated Respondent's struggle in defense of peace was greeted as its struggle. The German Democratic Republic said Respondent's fight is their fight "just as the struggle of the German friends of democracy and peace is your struggle." The Party of Great Britain expressed its "solidarity" with Respondent in the common struggle against Anglo-American imperialism. The Canadian Party expressed certainty that "Headed by the Mighty Socialist Soviet Union \* \* \* the world camp of peace is going forward to win" and that Respondent "will not be found wanting."

Respondent's teaching materials used in its training schools and for self-study by the members furnish, among other things, still further evidence on the following of the united front for peace line. The "Discussion Outline" on "The Marxist Position Toward War" (*supra*, p. 49 of this report) put out in 1949 devotes considerable space to "Peace" and lists works by Lenin and Stalin and the *History of the CPSU (B)* as reading material. The "Outline For Nine-Day School," issued in 1948 (Pet. Ex. 346), has as the topic for the third lesson "Imperialism-War-Fascism-Struggle For Peace" and lists Lenin's *Imperialism* and the *United Front Against Fascism* as the reading material. Part II of the Study Outline for the Marxist Institute, issued in 1949 (Pet. Ex. 427), includes the study of the tactics of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International and teaches that in the present period the strategic objective remains the same but the tactical line of the united front and peoples coalition developed still further, citing Dimitrov's report to the *Seventh World Congress* as required reading and the *History of the CPSU (B)* as supplemental reading (Session 9, pp. 1-3).

We find based on the foregoing and upon the entire record, that "the struggle for peace" including the tactic of the united front for

peace, is presently a main line of Respondent, the Soviet Union, and the Communist Information Bureau, and that this line is based upon the tactics set forth in Marxism-Leninism. It is therefore important to consider what the Communists mean by "peace," as an aid in determining whether the "peace" line is a link or tactic in seeking to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement. The testimony of Petitioner's witness Lautner regarding the united front tactic as heretofore set forth is relevant to this matter. Also, the *History of the CPSU (B)* teaches:

The Bolsheviks were not mere pacifists who sighed for peace and confined themselves to the propaganda of peace, as the majority of the Left Social-Democrats did. The Bolsheviks advocated an active revolutionary struggle for peace, to the point of overthrowing the rule of the bellicose imperialist bourgeoisie. The Bolsheviks linked up the cause of peace with the cause of the victory of the proletarian revolution, holding that the surest way of ending the war and securing a just peace, a peace without annexations and indemnities, was to overthrow the rule of the imperialist bourgeoisie (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 167).

The *History* further teaches that to achieve "peace" the Communist Parties should convert imperialist war into civil war and defeat one's own government in an imperialist war (*ibid.*, p. 167).

The understanding of the "struggle for peace" as an active, revolutionary struggle is further evidenced from a resolution adopted in 1935 by the Comintern, which resolution reads in part as follows:

At the present historical juncture, when on one-sixth part of the globe the Soviet Union defends socialism and peace for all humanity, the most vital interests of the workers and toilers of all countries demand that in pursuing the policy of the working class, in waging the struggle for peace, the struggle against imperialist war before and after the outbreak of hostilities, the defense of the Soviet Union must be considered paramount (Pet. Ex. 137, p. 48).

These tactics are also revealed in Dimitroff's *The United Front*, a part of the body of Marxism-Leninism, which says, *inter alia*:

\* \* \* You cannot carry on a real struggle against fascism if you do not render all possible assistance in strengthening the *most important buttress* of this struggle, the Soviet Union. You cannot carry on a serious struggle against fascist instigators of a new world blood bath, if you do not render undivided support to the U. S. S. R., a *most important factor* in the maintenance of international peace \* \* \* (Pet. Ex. 149, p. 279, emphasized in text).

Additional insight into Respondent's use of the "struggle for peace" is furnished by the aforementioned "greeting" sent to Respondent by the Soviet Union on the occasion of Respondent's 15th National Convention in late 1954. This "greeting" is later herein discussed in more detail with respect to the issue of Respondent's reporting to the Soviet Union. Petitioner's witness Lautner, based on his experiences as a member of Respondent including what he taught and was taught, considers the greeting "a political document of the highest importance" (Tr. 10068), which raises all the basic questions that Respondent is confronted with at the present time and "gives leadership to the American Party" (Tr. 10069). Lautner interprets "struggle for peace, democracy and socialism" as "the new tactical approach since the end of the war, the link with which this tactical united front is to be built." (Tr. 10070); and so we conclude.

In view of the foregoing and upon the entire record, we find and conclude that the "struggle for peace" as used and practiced by respondent, sometimes called the "struggle against reaction", represents the present emphasis of the "struggle against imperialism" which is and has been a basic, active, revolutionary doctrine taught



and advocated by respondent for the purpose of overthrowing "imperialist" governments (by force and violence if necessary) and substituting the dictatorship of the proletariat. We further conclude and find that respondent's "struggle for peace," "struggle against imperialism" and united-front tactics followed in connection therewith, represent a continued following of directives of the Soviet Union as contained in Marxism-Leninism, in specific instructions of the Soviet Union and in the program of the Communist International; and are designed to advance the objectives of the world Communist movement.

#### 4. *Democratic Centralism and Self-Criticism*

Respondent's use of the organizational principle known as democratic centralism, hereinbefore referred to under "Marxism-Leninism", is one of the many facts indicative of its operation pursuant to directives from the Soviet Union through which the policies of the Soviet Union are effectuated.

The *Programme of the Communist International* covers democratic centralism as follows:

The Communist International and its Sections are built up on the basis of democratic centralism, the fundamental principles of which are: (a) Election of all leading committees of the Party \* \* \*; (b) periodical reports by leading Party committees to their constituents; (c) decisions of superior Party committees to be obligatory for subordinate committees, strict Party discipline and prompt execution of the decisions of the Communist International, of its leading committees and of the leading Party centres.

Party questions may be discussed by the members of the Party and by Party organizations until such time as a decision is taken upon them by the competent Party committees. After a decision has been taken by the Congress of the Communist International, by the Congress of the respective Sections, or by leading committees of the Comintern, and of its various Sections; these decisions must be unreservedly carried out even if a Section of the Party membership or of the local Party organizations are in disagreement with it (Pet. Ex. 125, p. 86).

Respondent admittedly follows and applies the principle of democratic centralism.<sup>36</sup> It has done so substantially throughout most of its existence. In 1945, when Respondent was reconstituted as the Communist Party, its leader, William Z. Foster, proclaimed:

\* \* \* Only by applying the sound principles of Leninist democratic-centralism can our Party keep its mistakes to a minimum and develop the clear-thinking unity of action and resolute discipline that are the great strength of Communist parties all over the world (Pet. Ex. 372, p. 793).

Respondent's position with respect to the issue of democratic centralism is as expressed by its counsel in arguing before us: "What has all that got to do with domination and control by Moscow?" (Tr. Jan. 7, 1953, p. 51). Respondent's evidence is to the effect that the principle of democratic centralism is the ultimate in democracy in that the rank-and-file members elect the next higher officers and so on up to the highest authority of the Party—the national convention. Respondent states that once a decision is reached by the majority, that decision is binding on the whole body.

Witnesses for the Petitioner testify to a different understanding of democratic centralism.

Gitlow stated: "The Communist Party in the United States was a centralized organization, ruled from the top down, and not from the bottom up;" and when he, Lovestone, and Wolf were deposed in the schism of 1929, arrangements were made in Moscow that control of

<sup>36</sup> Respondent's witness Gates says democratic centralism is the principle which governs the party organization and function. He does not, however, indicate its origin.

the United States party was to be vested in a representative of the Communist International who was given specific power to nullify any decision that any committee or any branch of the CPUSA made. He was also given power to expel any member of the party as well as other powers over the party.

Kornfeder likened the party structure to a military one, with power coming from above.

Nowell testified that, during his membership (between 1929 and 1936), in actual practice authority descends upon the membership from the top.

We find that the materiality and relevancy of the issue of democratic centralism lies in its source as concerns Respondent's acceptance and practice of it, and in its use as a means of bringing Respondent within the authority of the Soviet Union. The record leaves no real doubt that, at least until 1940, Respondent followed democratic centralism as a requirement of membership in the Communist International,<sup>37</sup> and that on the basis of democratic centralism all decisions of the Communist International had to be fulfilled by Respondent. From this it follows, based on the evidence elsewhere herein set forth, that for the period covering over twenty years of Respondent's existence, the principle of democratic centralism was one of the means whereby Respondent came within the authority of the Soviet Union.<sup>38</sup> Upon consideration of all of the evidence concerning Respondent's policies, activities, and conduct over the subsequent period of its existence, particularly the evidence covering non-deviation and allegiance as elsewhere set forth in this report, it is reasonable to conclude, and we do so, that Respondent's continued following of the principle of democratic centralism keeps Respondent within the authority of the Soviet Union.

We further find that the principle of democratic centralism is one of the policies established by the government and Communist Party of the Soviet Union, through adaptations of Marxism-Leninism, as an organizational policy of the world Communist movement, and that Respondent's operations based upon the following of the principle evidences the purpose to effectuate the policies of the Soviet Union and of the world Communist movement.

In making our findings and conclusions concerning democratic centralism, we have taken into consideration the disciplinary aspect of the principle which is treated later in this report.<sup>39</sup> We have also taken into consideration the evidence concerning the collateral Marxist-Leninist concept or device called self-criticism, as followed and understood by Respondent. In arguing about self-criticism before us, Respondent's counsel stated as follows concerning self-criticism:

Another instruction or directive that the recommended decision relies on is what the Marxists call self-criticism. What is self-criticism? You get it from the books that are in evidence here. You get it from testimony of the witnesses. It is the proposition that Marxists assert that any serious political party should be willing openly to admit its mistakes, should discuss its mistakes of the past openly, and in the course of such public and open discussion also decide how those mistakes should be corrected. That is all that this principle of self-criticism means (Tr. Jan. 7, 1953, p. 54).

<sup>37</sup> See pp. 9 to 14 concerning the Communist International and Respondent's membership therein.

<sup>38</sup> See pp. 27 to 28 herein.

<sup>39</sup> This includes the evidence furnished by Petitioner's witness Johnson and others which establishes that in the past Respondent's organization included a Central Control Commission—the national disciplinary body—which was the American section of the International Control Commission in Moscow that maintained the strictest, iron discipline in the Party and kept every Communist in line.



The record, however, shows that the source of the doctrine and its use by Respondent lies in Marxism-Leninism and has as its primary purpose keeping Communists in line with the policies of the Soviet Union. As elsewhere herein noted, Respondent in 1945 reemphasized the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism and expelled Earl Browder as a "revisionist." Those who had supported Browder engaged in "self-criticism" by saying that they were wrong in adhering to Browder's deemphasis of the revolutionary line of Marxism-Leninism and in committing the other errors pointed out by Jacques Duclos, a spokesman for the world Communist movement.

"Self-criticism" is a device for safeguarding the unity of the Party and the iron discipline required by the Soviet Union. Elsewhere herein we discuss the evidence on these points in more detail. It is pertinent here to set forth a few illustrations from the record. Respondent's *Manual on Organization* contains the following:<sup>40</sup>

It is clear, however, that basic principles and decisions, such, as for example, the Program of the Communist International, cannot be questioned in the Party (Pet. Ex. 145, p. 26).

We do not question the correctness of the revolutionary theory of the class struggle laid down by Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin (*ibid*, pp. 26 and 27).

Self-criticism is a natural part of the life of the Party \* \* \*. Without self-criticism, there can be no Communist Party. But this criticism must never depart from the line of the Party, from the principles of Marxism-Leninism. \* \* \* destructive criticism \* \* \* if tolerated \* \* \* leads to factionalism (*ibid*, pp. 32 and 33).

In short, the policies of the Soviet Union cannot be questioned.

An "Outline On Fundamentals of Marxism For Class Use or Self Study," issued by Respondent's National Educational Commission, cites Stalin's *Foundations of Leninism* as the "source of unity and discipline in the Communist Party" and quotes from Lenin, *Selected Works*, on the practice of self-criticism (Pet. Ex. 370, p. 31), which is indicative of the source of Respondent's use of the doctrine. Further, an article in *Political Affairs* for January 1951 covering the main resolutions of Respondent's 15th National Convention, treats with the practice of criticism and self-criticism as "the inner law of Party development" (Pet. Ex. 378, p. 33) and includes the following:

Thus the whole Party does not often enough participate in evaluating major developments and struggles; does not sufficiently learn from mistakes committed.

This in turn leads to many "independent" estimates which are not resolved into one single Party estimate. This tends to weaken Party discipline and the carrying out of Party decisions (pp. 33 and 34).

The 15th National Convention of the Communist Party, U. S. A., demonstrates the firm political unity of our Party. It calls upon the whole membership to guard the monolithic character and unity of our Party, based on democratic centralism. We must strive for the highest discipline arising out of conscious understanding of the Party's theory and political line. Tendencies toward factionalism are totally impermissible and must be sharply dealt with because they weaken the Party and make it possible for the enemy more easily to penetrate its ranks (pp. 34 and 35).

In view of the foregoing and upon consideration of the evidence concerning discipline and allegiance as later in this report reviewed, and upon the record as a whole, we find and conclude that Respondent

<sup>40</sup> According to Respondent's witnesses, the *Manual* is obsolete in Party circles. On the other hand, the evidence furnished by witnesses Nowell, Crouch, Lantner, and Budenz, and the fact that the author of the *Manual*, J. Peters, a high officer of Respondent, only left the United States and Party work in 1949, preponderates to establish the continued use of the *Manual* until at least 1949.

practices the doctrine of self-criticism in compliance with the requirements of the Soviet Union and for the purpose of keeping its members in line with the policies and directives laid down by the Soviet Union.

#### 5. *Foreign Representatives in the United States*

The foregoing facts concerning Respondent's organizational structure and the changes therein, the true meaning and use of Marxism-Leninism, and Respondent's policies and activities in "the struggle against imperialism" demonstrate and confirm the international character of the world Communist movement; that Respondent is the United States section or part of that movement; and, that the movement is dominated and controlled by the Soviet Union. Further confirmation and demonstration are found in the evidence concerning other activities or programs which the record establishes are the subjects of Respondent's major attention and efforts. These are hereinafter covered under the headings "Major Programs" and "The Communist Press."

We find that from time to time throughout Respondent's existence, the formulation and carrying out of its policies, programs, and activities as aforesaid have been directed or supervised by foreign representatives in the United States from the Soviet Union; this serves to illuminate and explain the basis and source of the policies and activities, and further illustrates the international aspects of Respondent's operations, as well as the foreign control thereover. A condition of the Communist International which was accepted and followed by Respondent was that:

The E. C. C. I. and its Presidium have the right to send their representatives to the various Sections of the Communist International. Such representatives receive their instructions from the E. C. C. I. or from its Presidium, and are responsible to them for their activities. Representatives of the E. C. C. I. have the right to participate in meetings of the central Party bodies as well as of the local organizations of the Sections to which they are sent. \* \* \* Representatives of the E. C. C. I. are especially obliged to supervise the carrying out of the decisions of the World Congresses and of the Executive Committee of the Communist International (Pet. Ex. 125, pp. 89 and 90).

It would unduly burden this report to trace the many instances of record where such foreign representatives have been in the United States and active in the affairs of Respondent. Among such representatives identified in the record are Gerhardt Eisler (sometimes known as Edwards and Hans Berger), J. Peters, Pogany (John Pepper), Gplos, Peterson, Frank Miller, P. Green (Gussev), Yusefovich, Merker (Wagner), Walettsky, and Allen. Limiting this report to a few examples, the record supports the testimony of Petitioner's witness Johnson who testified, based on what he was taught in Respondent's training school in 1932, that a representative of the Comintern had power superseding that of any leader in the American Party and was the complete boss over Respondent's policy. Similarly, Petitioner's witness Lautner shows that when a Comintern representative spoke at Party meetings, no one questioned his decisions and they were accepted as the Party line.

In the light of the record, we find that many of the policies and activities presently being carried out by Respondent were originally formulated under the supervision of representatives of the Communist International, and that this fact is indicative of foreign domination and control of Respondent. This, however, is not the entire state



of the record as to activities of foreign representatives. When viewed in the light of the facts that Respondent announced its disaffiliation from the Comintern in 1940 to avoid identification as a foreign agent in the United States, and that the dissolution of the Comintern was announced in 1943 as a tactical move for unity in World War II and to eliminate that manifestation of foreign direction over the member Communist Parties, the less apparent but yet identifiable subsequent activities of foreign representatives in the United States becomes significant.

We have previously found that Manuilsky, while a Soviet Union representative to the United Nations in 1945, sent word to Respondent to the effect that it should heed Duclos' statement concerning the reconstitution of the Communist Party.<sup>41</sup> Other individuals who had previously been here as Communist International representatives are identified on the record as active in the United States after 1940. J. Peters and Gerhard Eisler<sup>42</sup> are the subjects of considerable testimony.

Respondent's witness Flynn states on direct examination that since she assumed her duties as a member of the National Committee in 1938, Respondent has not received any directives or instructions from any representative of the CPSU and that to her knowledge no Communist International representative has been in the United States since 1946. She knows Gerhard Eisler but did not meet him until after his arrest. She states that neither he nor any of her fellow officers in the CPUSA ever told her that he (Eisler) was a representative of the Communist International. The testimony of Respondent's witness Gates is to the same effect.

Of the reputed Communist International representatives in the United States, Eisler was the most conspicuous and most noteworthy. Eisler was in this country for many years and fled the United States while on bail, pending the appeal of his conviction in 1949 for false swearing. Witness Kornfeder shows that in 1933 Eisler, whom he had originally met in Moscow, was a Comintern representative in the United States and discussed with him the infiltration of the American Federation of Labor and the Railroad Brotherhoods. Eisler warned him of serious consequences if he spoke against a new trade-union policy at a national convention of the Communist Party in 1934. Kornfeder disregarded Eisler's warning and was told to repudiate in the Party press within sixty days what he had said. He was expelled from the Party. Witness Johnson stated that Eisler's word was law in the CPUSA. Witness Meyer knew Eisler as a Comintern representative, as did witness Lautner. Lautner testified that after 1945 he knew that Eisler undertook to influence Party activities in the United States. Witness Budenz said that Stachel, a high Party leader, received orders from Eisler in 1943 and 1944, and that there was talk of Eisler as a Comintern representative in 1945. During this period Stachel consulted with Eisler frequently.

Another person conspicuously active in the activities of the CPUSA was J. Peters, author of Respondent's *Manual On Organization*. Witness Nowell identifies him as a Comintern representative. Witness

<sup>41</sup> See *supra* p. 16.

<sup>42</sup> The record shows that both Peters and Eisler as well as other Comintern representatives have used various other names and aliases. Eisler has been known as "Edwards" and "Berger," and on one occasion he asked witness Nowell to call him "Brown." J. Peters was also known as William Peters, Alexander Stevens, and Clarence Miller. Also as Joe Peters, Alexander, or Goldberg.

Crouch said he took orders from Peters between 1934 and 1940, and witnesses Johnson and Lautner testified that Peters provided them with secret codes.

Peters was deported in 1949. Subsequently, an official actively engaged in Respondent's youth activities met Peters in Hungary while the former was attending the World Youth Festival there.

We find that the testimony of Petitioner's witnesses is credible and that the testimony of Respondent's witnesses is not in accord with the facts in this matter. A preponderance of the evidence clearly shows that representatives of the CPSU were in the United States and that through them Respondent received directives and instructions.

#### 6. *The Communist Press*

In addition to the foregoing, further indication that the Respondent operates pursuant to directives of the Soviet Union, and is controlled by the Soviet Union in its views and policies, is furnished by the evidence hereinafter summarized concerning the Communist press and its use for the exchange of information. In the United States the *Daily Worker* and *Political Affairs* operate as guides for the membership of Respondent as to the correct views and policies. In the Soviet Union, the organ of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union is a paper called *Pravda*. On an international scale, *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* is the organ of the Information Bureau of the Communist and Workers' Parties (Cominform).

We find that one significant aspect of the issue of domination and control lies in the formation, nature, and character of the *Daily Worker*. The record shows that the Communist International required the member parties to "create a new type of periodical press \* \* \* in which the Communists \* \* \* learn to utilize the slightest liberty allowed by the laws \* \* \*" and without which "the preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat is impossible" (Pet. Ex. 8, p. 20). The International also required that such a Party press carry on a policy fully corresponding to the policy of the Party; edited by reliable Communists; and subject to the control of the governing body of the Party (*ibid.*, p. 27). We find that the policy, content, and advocacy of the *Daily Worker* is and has been under the complete supervision and control of Respondent's leaders and top committees; that officers of Respondent have been the principal officers of the paper; that the paper's policies correspond to the policies of the Party and the paper is considered a necessity for the effectuation of the Party's aims and purposes. In its early years, the *Daily Worker* was aided by financial subsidies from Moscow and until about 1944 was furnished free information or dispatches at nominal cost, from Moscow through a Soviet Union news service. The record shows various directives issued by the Communist International concerning the *Daily Worker*, which were followed. Upon consideration of the foregoing and upon the whole record, we find and conclude that the *Daily Worker* was established pursuant to directives of the Communist International and presently fulfills the function it has always had.

We further find, on the basis of the evidence hereinafter summarized, that the *Daily Worker* is the counterpart in the United States of the Soviet Union organ, *Pravda*, translated issues of which are part of the record in this proceeding. While Petitioner's witness Budenz was managing editor of the *Daily Worker* (1941-45), staff



meetings were held for political education—"to keep the staff on their toes regarding Party theory and thinking"—at which meetings the *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (Bolsheviks)* was used. We have heretofore found that the *History* constitutes one of the principal sets of rules and guides followed by Respondent. It is stated in the *History* that, "A powerful instrument used by the Bolshevik Party to strengthen its organizations and to spread its influence among the masses was the Bolshevik daily newspaper *Pravda* \* \* \* founded, according to Lenin's instructions, on the initiative of Stalin, Olminsky, and Poletayev" (Pet. Ex. 330, p. 149). The *History* also states that *Pravda* "directed the working class movement toward one definite aim—preparation for revolution" (*ibid*, p. 153) and that a legally published newspaper "could not call openly for the overthrow of tsardom" and "had to resort to hints, which, however, the class-conscious workers understood very well \* \* \*" (*ibid*, p. 150). Examples are given of "modest" sounding words which were understood by the workers as a "call" (*ibid*, p. 151). Respondent's official concept of the *Daily Worker* in the 1930's, which the record shows still persists, is that the paper is "One of the main and most important instruments of agitation and propaganda \* \* \* for reaching and winning the masses" (Pet. Ex. 145, pp. 78-79). This is pertinent for comparison with the aforequoted concept of *Pravda* as "A powerful instrument used by the Bolshevik Party to \* \* \* spread its influence among the masses."

We treat now with the issue as to whether the foreign Communist press contains articles or statements that constitute directives or instructions to Respondent. Respondent's witness Gates is a member of the National Committee, and is editor of the *Daily Worker*.<sup>43</sup> He denies that any foreign publication contains directives to the Respondent. The testimony of Respondent's other two witnesses is to the same effect. On the other hand, while petitioner's witness Budenz was managing editor of the *Daily Worker*, "the Communists looked in these articles from Moscow for the directives and the line that was to be pursued, the attitude that should be taken."

The direct oral testimony, however, is not the full state of the record in the premises. In resolving this issue, we have taken into consideration the facts elsewhere herein set forth concerning "non-deviation," and particularly, as established by a review of the pertinent documents of record, the fact that the *Daily Worker* does not deviate from or disagree with the Soviet press.<sup>44</sup> We have also taken into consideration the background of the Communist press in this country and in the Soviet Union as heretofore set forth, and the aforementioned principle that the press resorts to "hints" or "modest" language but which the "workers" understand. Further, it is not seriously disputed on the record that the *Daily Worker* receives political news from abroad, particularly from Moscow, which includes translations from the Soviet press, and that a correspondent of the *Daily Worker* is stationed in Moscow.

Additional evidence on this issue consists of the fact that the Communist publication *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* is

<sup>43</sup> He held these positions prior to starting to serve a prison sentence for conviction in 1950 for violation of the Smith Act, and, as far as he knows, still retains the positions.

<sup>44</sup> Respondent's witness Gates says the similarity between Respondent's views and those of the Soviet Union is only the coincidence of the common application of Marxist-Leninist principles.

distributed in the United States to functionaries of Respondent, and copies have been made available by Respondent to meetings of various of Respondent's committees and groups. Petitioner's witness, Matusow, furnishes an example of the effect of an article in *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy*. In the summer of 1948, the director of the Jefferson School gave a lecture at the school's summer camp to the effect that the Communists agreed with Tito and Yugoslavia and all the things they were trying to do. A few weeks later, the news was published in *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* that Marshal Tito and the Yugoslav Communist Party had been denounced by the Cominform. The same school director then took the reverse position in his lectures although his only source of information was the Cominform journal.

Other parts of this report present our findings concerning the well-established requirement of the Soviet Union that vigilance be maintained against "reformists," "opportunists," "stool pigeons," etc.; and the application in this respect of the Communist doctrine of self-criticism. An article by Gilbert Green, high officer of Respondent, entitled "For Communist Vigilance" appears in the May 1950 issue of *Political Affairs*. The article refers to the way in which the Polish and Bulgarian Communist Parties dealt with lack of vigilance—"the reflection of opportunism in the thinking and work of the Party"—and quotes articles from *Pravda* and *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* on the need for Bolshevik criticism and self-criticism. It is reasonable to conclude from the article that the author considered the foreign articles as authoritative instructions.

Some of the articles which are in evidence from *Pravda* contain specific reference to the United States. The March 11, 1950, issue (Pet. Ex. 217) contains a speech by Molotov on the international situation in which the following appears:

The democratic camp, which unites the USSR and the countries of the people's democracy, is opposed by the camp of the imperialist powers headed by the ruling circles of the United States of America (*ibid*, p. 6).

It is our permanent task and important duty to watch everything that is going on in the camp of imperialism (*ibid*, p. 6).

We fully stand for the Leninist-Stalinist principles of peaceful coexistence of the two systems and their peaceful economic competition. But we know it to be true that while imperialism exists, there also exists the danger of new aggression and that in the presence of imperialism and its predatory plans wars are unavoidable. Therefore, the advocates of a durable peace among the peoples must not be passive and become empty pacifists who are charmed by phrases, but they must every day conduct a stubborn and still more effective struggle for peace, drawing into it the masses of the people and not stopping before appropriate measures when the imperialists attempt to unleash new aggression (*ibid*, p. 11).

When read in the light of the considerable evidence of record respecting Respondent's position concerning the United States as an aggressive, imperialist power, and Respondent's policies and activities in the struggle for peace, all of which is set forth in detail elsewhere in this report, it is reasonable to conclude that the foregoing article in *Pravda* demonstrates that the so-called struggle for peace is used in order "to sweep imperialism and aggression from the face of the earth forever" (Pet. Ex. 217, p. 11).



Upon the whole record, we find and conclude that articles published in *Pravda* and *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* are understood by Respondent and treated as authoritative instructions or directives as to the line to be taken or the policy to be pursued.

### 7. Major programs

We have hereinbefore referred to the fact that Marxism-Leninism, through the so-called Classics, sets forth certain programs and policies as the means of forwarding the world revolution. Particular emphasis as to programs (as distinguished from organization and discipline in the world Communist movement and from the strategies and tactics for the overthrow of imperialism), is placed upon work in and with labor unions, youth, and minority groups (see pp. 33 to 37, *supra*).

We also find that such programs were basic requirements of the Communist International and have been and are constantly advanced by the Soviet Union. We find further that Respondent early formulated and has consistently carried out such programs in the United States in conformance with Marxism-Leninism and pursuant to other directives of the Communist International and of the Soviet Union, and that the formulation and carrying out of such programs have as their aims and purposes the advancement of the objectives of the world Communist movement. The evidence as to Respondent's activities in and with labor unions, youth, and minority groups, particularly the Negroes, is voluminous. It would unduly burden this report to set forth the many detailed facts from which the foregoing findings are established. We limit ourselves to what we consider the more significant—those in the past which determine the source and illuminate the present, and those of more or less current use and application which determine the continuity and consistency.

It is clear, and as we read the record not disputed, that major attention is given by Respondent to trade-union work, to youth and to "the struggle for national liberation of the Negro people." At issue are the reasons for this attention—why and for what purposes. In other words, this proceeding is concerned with whether these policies and activities were formulated and are being carried out on Respondent's initiative or whether they come within Section 13 (a) (1) of the Act.

The preceding section of this report which establishes the meaning of Marxism-Leninism as understood and used by Respondent shows that trade-union work, youth work, and work among the minorities, are given importance in the world Communist movement. Trade unions and youth under Marxism-Leninism are the "belts" and "levers" without whose aid the dictatorship of the proletariat cannot be realized, while the directing force is the Party. Trade unions are "a school of Communism"; youth are "young reserves"; and national minorities have "latent revolutionary capacities." Under the Classics, Communists are taught the necessity of "winning over and "utilizing" trade unions in order to carry on the struggle against the government; the necessity of "organizing the Marxist-Leninist training of youth"; and, the necessity of "utilizing" the latent revolutionary capacities of the minority groups for "the overthrow of imperialism."

Additional evidence as to the importance of trade unions, youth, and national minorities in the world Communist movement is furnished by the consistent requirements of the Communist International. The *Theses and Statutes* required that the component member parties carry on Communist work in labor unions and form Communist groups within the organizations to "win over labor unions to Communism" and "to subordinate the unions to the practical leadership of the Party, as the advance guard of the workers' revolution" (Pet. Ex. 8, pp. 29-57); that organizational relations between youth and the Communist Party be basically defined in every country after the same system (p. 8) and, that a policy be carried out for the closest union between all national and colonial liberation movements and Soviet Russia—"to support the revolutionary movement among the subject nations (for example, Ireland, American Negroes, etc.) and in the colonies" (p. 69, emphasis added). In discussing preparation for the dictatorship of the proletariat, the *Theses and Statutes* says in part:

In every organization, union, association—beginning with the proletarian ones at first, and afterwards in all those of the nonproletarian workers and exploited masses (political, professional, military, cooperative, educational, sporting, etc.) must be formed groups or nuclei of Communists—mostly open ones, but also secret ones which become necessary in each case when the arrest or exile of their members or the dispersal of their organization is threatened; and these nuclei, in close contact with one another and with the central Party, exchanging experiences, carrying on the work of propaganda, campaign, organization, adapting themselves to all the branches of social life, to all the various forms and subdivisions of the working masses, must systematically train themselves, the Party, the class, and the masses by such multiform work (p. 16).

The *Programme of the Communist International* further emphasizes these policies and activities. Concerning trade unions, the *Programme* says:

\* \* \* It is particularly important for the purpose of winning over the majority of the proletariat, to capture the *trade unions* (emphasized in text), which are genuine mass working class organizations closely bound up with the every day struggles of the working class. To work in reactionary trade unions and skillfully to capture them, to win the confidence of the broad masses of the industrially organized workers, to change and "remove from their posts" the reformist leaders, represent important tasks in the preparatory period (Pet. Ex. 125, p. 76).

With respect to youth, the *Programme*, in what we find to be adherence to the principles of Lenin and Stalin, points out that the Party relies directly on the mass organizations which include youth, and that systematic work must be carried on among the proletarian and peasant youth (p. 82).

Concerning minorities, the *Programme* points out the necessity to support every movement "against imperialist violence in the colonies, semicolonies, and dependencies themselves"; to carry on propaganda against all forms of chauvinism and against the "imperialist maltreatment of enslaved peoples and races, big and small (treatment of Negroes, yellow labor, anti-Semitism, etc.)."

Still further evidence concerning the role to be given trade unions, youth, and national minorities in the world Communist movement lies in the official organ of the Communist Information Bureau. The December 2, 1949, issue of *For a Lasting Peace, for a People's Democracy* contains a report submitted to the Cominform by M. Suslov, representative of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, entitled "Defense of Peace And The Struggle Against The Warmongers,"



which emphasizes the necessity of drawing trade unions into the "camp of the fighters for peace, against the warmongers"; it points out the help that can be furnished by youth; and says that the duty of the Communist and working class parties in the capitalist countries is to merge the struggle for the national independence with the struggle for peace (Pet. Ex. 249, p. 3). The Zhdanov report, previously herein referred to, includes the following statement:

Imperialist countries like the United States, Britain and countries near to them become dangerous foes of the national independence and self-determination of nations, while the Soviet Union and the countries of the new democracy are a secure bulwark in the defense of the equality and national self-determination of nations (Pet. Ex. 214, p. 22).

Upon consideration of the foregoing and upon the entire record, we find and conclude that trade union work, the training and organization of youth, and national liberation movements, all under the guidance of the Communist Party, are essential elements in carrying out the world Communist movement and that these policies were formulated and have been from time to time implemented by Lenin and Stalin, the Communist International, and the Communist Information Bureau. We proceed to examine the record concerning Respondent's use and application of these elements. Evidence as to Respondent's direction in its trade union and national liberation programs is furnished from an article by "Alex Bittelman" which was printed in the March 1934 issue of Respondent's magazine *The Communist* (Pet. Ex. 126). The author, Bittelman, is presently a high official of Respondent. The theme of the article was to seek to make it appear that the Communist International did not "interfere" in American affairs or "dictate" to Respondent, but that Respondent heeded the Comintern in the exercise of Respondent's own conviction and will.<sup>45</sup>

With respect to trade union work, Bittelman wrote in part as follows:

The next milestone in the Comintern leadership for the American party we find on the question of trade union work. \* \* \* The Comintern brought the American militants and lefts closer to the world labor movement and to the basic problems of the American labor movement. The trade union question was one of them. \* \* \* Even the best and most experienced among the left and militant leaders of the American workers \* \* \*, such as the late Charles E. Ruthenberg, as well as the present leader of our Party, William Z. Foster, were able to rid themselves and our movement of the old ballast of opportunism only by coming closer to Leninism and into the Comintern \* \* \* (p. 239).

It was Comintern advice and guidance that helped the American Communists to turn full face to the building of a left wing in the reformist unions beginning with 1920; it was the advice of the Comintern that helped formulate a correct solution to one of the basic problems of the American proletariat—the organization of the unorganized into trade unions; it was advice of the Comintern on independent leadership of the economic struggles by the revolutionary elements that helped formulate strike policies and tactics; \* \* \* (p. 240).

Comintern influence on the development of revolutionary trade union policies in the United States has especial significance. \* \* \* It is significant, therefore, that the first question which Comrade Stalin put to the American trade union delegates was: "How do you account for the small percentage of American workers organized in trade unions?" \* \* \* the intent of Stalin's question is clear: Why don't you organize the workers in trade unions? Why don't you strengthen them

<sup>45</sup> Bittelman's attempt to explain away control by the Comintern is not in accord with the facts. From the record as a whole, it is apparent that the Comintern in fact dominated and controlled Respondent under conditions whereby Respondent could not exercise its own volition in any major respect. An example is furnished, among many, by Kornfeder's expulsion from the Party for failure to follow the instructions of a Comintern representative. See p. 60 herein. Cf. Nowell's trial by the Comintern for opposing the Negro policy of the Comintern, pp. 75-76.

against the capitalists? (pp. 240-241). And it was in this direction that the Comintern threw the full weight of its influence and advice in the American labor movement. \* \* \* Tactics and methods of work might vary, depending upon the state of the class struggle. \* \* \* But the strategic aim always remained the same, and for this aim the Communist Party fights bravely and persistently and with increasing effectiveness. \* \* \* So, we ask again: can any American worker, who is alive to the needs of his class and is willing to fight for them, find anything to object to in this "interference" of the Communist International in American affairs? And will he object to the Communist Party of the U. S. accepting and taking deep satisfaction in such "interference"? No, he will not \* \* \* (p. 241).

And concerning the matter of national liberation, the article includes:

Once more came the "outside" influence of the Comintern, and what did it say? It said that the struggle against discrimination and for Negro rights is a revolutionary struggle for the national liberation of the Negroes, that we must fight for complete Negro equality, and that in the Black Belt the full realization of this demand requires the fight for the national self-determination of the Negroes, including the right to separation from the United States and the organization of an independent state. Furthermore, it was the interpretation of Leninism and its application to the United States as made by the Comintern that showed the American Communists that the agrarian revolution in the Black Belt, \* \* \* is the basis of the national-liberation movement and that this movement is one of the allies of the American proletariat in the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. \* \* \* Will the Negro workers, farmers, and city poor consider the Comintern advice on the Negro question 'outside dictation'? No. They will, as they actually do, receive this advice with outstretched arms and will continue in every-larger masses to rally around the Communist Party as the leader of the liberation fight \* \* \* (ibid., p. 244).

A review of Respondent's early documents and the testimony of witnesses who were officials of Respondent during its formative years, establish that Respondent gave to trade unions, youth, and minorities as prominent a place in its structure as did the founders of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the Soviet Union. Respondent's articles, publications and other documents, together with the testimony of witnesses, show that throughout its existence and up to the time of this proceeding, Respondent has continued to give importance to trade union work, the mass organization and training of youth, and the struggle for national liberation of the Negroes. It is not necessary to review herein the considerable quantity of evidence that shows the extent of Respondent's policies and activities in furtherance of the world Communist trade union, youth, and national liberation movements; nor to review the large quantity of evidence from which we find that these policies and activities of Respondent represent to a substantial degree the continued following and adherence by Respondent to unrepudiated directives given by the Soviet Union. We limit this report to some of the more significant indications. For clarity, we treat the subjects separately. The evidence hereinafter set forth is in addition to the fact, which we find, that Respondent's policies and activities with trade unions, with youth, and in the struggle for national liberation are based upon and adhere to Marxism-Leninism.

#### (a) Trade-Union Work

In 1927, Benjamin Gitlow, at the time a member of the Politburo of Respondent and its Central Committee, was sent by Respondent to the Soviet Union at the special request of the Communist International to attend the Plenary sessions of the Executive Committee of the Communist International. While there, Gitlow, and other



leaders of Respondent, met with Joseph Stalin at Stalin's office at the Headquarters of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union: Stalin directed the Communist Party to make a very serious effort, among other things, to get a foothold in the trade-union movement of the United States, in order to attract to the Communist Party a much larger membership, and to await a sharpening of the economic and social situation in the United States for future revolutionary action.

It will be noted that Stalin's statement is in line with the policies of Marxism-Leninism and of the Comintern, to which we have previously referred. The record shows that Respondent has continuously and consistently placed major emphasis on trade-union work to build up the Party and to aid in what Respondent sometimes calls the "class struggle."

Petitioner's witness Nowell in 1929 received instructions from the Central Committee of Respondent concerning an elaborate program, later adopted at the founding convention (which Nowell attended as a representative) of a national parent organization—Trade Union Unity League—affiliated with the Red International of Labor Unions in Moscow, for organizing industrial workers in basic industries as well as to foster Communism in unions and for facilitating the proletarian revolution. In 1935, Nowell was instructed as an official of Respondent to gain control of local unions for the purpose of gaining hegemony of the C. I. O. After certain strikes in 1936, Respondent counted on the C. I. O. as part of the People's Front movement to influence United States home and foreign policy in conformity with the International People's Front movement outlined by Dimitroff in his Seventh World Congress speech and resolutions in August 1935.

The official minutes of the proceedings of Respondent's governing committees for a number of meetings during the period from late in 1925 to late in 1928 were put in evidence by Petitioner. Many of these minutes show action by Respondent concerning trade-union work pursuant to specific instructions and directives from the Communist International. (Examples are Petitioner's Exhibits Nos. 53, 63, 65, 77, 80, 87, and 91.)

The record shows that Respondent's tactics in its trade-union work have been changed at least three times pursuant to directives of the Communist International and to effectuate the policies of the Communist International. Originally, the policy was to operate in existing unions. This was changed in 1928 to a policy of concentrating on forming new unions. In 1934, the policy reverted to one of operating in existing unions. This policy is still in existence as established by the evidence herein reviewed. Respondent's united-front program in the trade-union field which presently receives considerable attention from Respondent, originated with the Communist International. As expressed in the aforementioned article by Alexander Bittelman:

\* \* \* In short, at every stage in the development of the revolutionary trade-union movement in the United States (TUEL, class struggle unions of the TUUL, the application of the united front on the trade-union field, the fight for trade-union unity, etc.), it was with the help of the Comintern that the American revolutionary workers were able to find the correct way, to correct their errors, and, through manifold changes in tactics, to press on to the goal of building a revolutionary trade-union movement in the United States (Pet. Ex. 126, p. 240).

Petitioner's witness Kornfeder taught a course at one of Respondent's schools at the national headquarters in New York in 1932

which covered Communist labor-union tactics and strategy, including the organization of secret groups inside of labor unions for the purpose of gaining control of such unions, and the preparation and conduct of strikes.<sup>46</sup>

At its national convention in 1950, respondent resolved:

We must face the fact that the overwhelming bulk of the organized workers in the country are in the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and independent Right-led unions. It is this which must determine the main direction of all of the Party's work, and especially its trade-union and industrial concentration policy (Pet. Ex. 378, p. 13).

In May 1940, Respondent published in its magazine, *The Communist*, an article by Dennis, then and now a high official of Respondent, entitled "The Bolshevization of the Communist Party In The Struggle Against The Imperialist War," which states it is particularly urgent, in accordance with certain conditions outlined by Stalin in *Pravda* in 1925, to conduct more consistent and effective activity among the A. F. of L. Workers.

An article by Henry Winston appearing in *Political Affairs* for September 1948 (Pet. Ex. 418), entitled "For a Fighting Party Rooted Among the Industrial Workers," was used in discussions at Party Club meetings in October and November 1948, attended by witness Matusow. The article concerns the necessity for mobilizing the workers in the factories as a main base for a successful fight against war and fascism. In a subsequent discussion of the article with witness Matusow, the writer, Winston, said that the question of industrial concentration and the movement of young people, members of the Communist Party youth movement, to basic industries was important at this time because in the event of any "imperialist war" it would be necessary to have people in basic industries to mobilize the workers against such war in an effort to slow down production and to do anything possible to see that such an "unjust war" should not be successful. The writer, Winston, is a member of Respondent's National Committee and was the National Organizational Secretary.

The February 1951 issue of *Political Affairs* (Pet. Ex. 376) "devoted to reports, speeches, and greetings of the 15th national convention of the Communist Party, USA, held in New York City on December 28-31, 1950," contains an article by John Williamson entitled "The Main Direction of the Party's Trade-Union Work" (pp. 54-73), which direction, the author says, must be "among the members of the reformist-led unions" (primarily the A. F. of L. and C. I. O.) (p. 66). The article refers to the role of the Party through its thirty-one years existence and concludes that "in general, the trade-union policies adopted by our Party were correct" (*ibid*, p. 72). According to Williamson:

The present situation demands from all Party trade unionists, especially in positions of leadership, closer ties with the Party, better understanding of policies, and a more vigorous fight for Party policies among the masses (*ibid*, pp. 72-73).

\* \* \* \* \*

We know \* \* \* our Party, headed by its helmsmen Foster and Dennis, will lead the working class safely to the port of Socialism (*ibid*, p. 73).

Petitioner's witness Janowitz was a member of Respondent both during the period it was called the Communist Political Association and after it reverted to the name Communist Party. He joined in

<sup>46</sup> His course also included one in Leninism, including the main doctrine calling for the total and complete overthrow of all existing social institutions, the government, and organizations which support the government, as well as the complete elimination of the present state structure and the substitution of a dictatorship led by the Communist Party.